



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

Per. 971 e. 44
N.s. 72

THE
CHRISTIAN
REMEMBRANCER.

A
Quarterly Review.

VOL. XLII.

JULY—DECEMBER.

LONDON :
PUBLISHED BY J. & C. MOZLEY,
6, PATERNOSTER ROW ;
AND D. APPLETON & CO. 348, BROADWAY, NEW YORK.

1862.



LONDON :
PRINTED BY R. CLAY, SON, AND TAYLOR,
BREAD STREET HILL.

C O N T E N T S

OF

No. CXIII.

	PAGE
ART. I.—History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Death of Elizabeth. By James Anthony Froude, M.A. late Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford. Vols. V. VI.	1
II.—Memoir of Joshua Watson. Edited by Edward Churton, Archdeacon of Cleveland	23
III.—The History of the Jews from the Christian Era to the Dawn of the Reformation. By Philip Henry Gosse	50
IV.—Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury. By W. F. Hook, D.D. Dean of Chichester. Vol. I. Anglo-Saxon Period	73
V.—The Influence of the Septuagint Version of the Old Testament upon the Progress of Christianity. By the Rev. Ralph Charlton, B.A. Fellow of King's College, Cambridge.....	109
VI.—Œuvres inédites de Monsieur Dufriche-Desgenettes, Curé de Notre-Dame-des-Victoires, à Paris, Fondateur de l'Archiconfrérie du saint et immaculé Cœur de Marie, pour la conversion des Pécheurs ; contenant ses Sermons, Prônes, Instructions, Plans et Notes sur divers sujets de la Religion, précédées d'une Notice biographique, d'un Portrait de l'Auteur et d'un autographe de sa main. Publiées sous la direction de M. l'Abbé G. Desfossés, Vicaire de la Paroisse	113
VII.—On the Study of the Evidences of Christianity. By Baden Powell, M.A. F.R.S. &c. &c. Savilian Professor of Geometry in the University of Oxford.....	149

NO. CXIII.—N.S.

	PAGE
ART. VIII.—An Introduction to the Study of Dogmatic Theology. By the Rev. Robert Owen, B.D. Fellow of Jesus College, Oxford	179
IX.—1. Kaiserwerth Deaconesses.	
2. The First Ten Years of the House of Mercy, Clewer.	
3. Thoughts on Religious Communities, or Letters of Two Friends.	
4. The Constitutions of the Guild of S. Alban.	
5. Hospitals and Sisterhoods.	
6. Church Deaconesses.	
7. The Oxford Churchman's Union. 1st Report.	
8. Historical Sketch of English Brotherhoods.	
9. Josiah Woodward's Rise and Progress of Religious Societies of London	200
X.—1. Lectures on the History of the Eastern Church, with an Introduction on the Study of Ecclesiastical History. By Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, D.D. Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Oxford, and Canon of Christ Church.	
2. Acta Patriarchatus Constantinopolitani, mcccxv —mcccclii. e Codd. MSS. sumptus præbente Cæsareâ scientiarum Academiâ, ediderunt Fr. Miklosich, Prof. Univers. Vindobon. et Jos. Müller, Prof. Universit. Patavinæ. Tomus prior.	
3. Σύνταγμα τῶν Θείων καὶ ἱερῶν κανονῶν τῶν τε ἁγίων καὶ πανευφύμων ἀποστόλων, καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν οἰκουμενικῶν καὶ τοπικῶν συνόδων, καὶ τῶν κατὰ μέρος ἁγίων πατέρων, ἐκδοθεν, σὺν πλείσταις ἄλλαις τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν κατάστασιν διεπούσαις διατάξεσι, μετὰ τῶν ἀρχαίων ἐξηγητῶν, καὶ διαφόρων ἀναγνωσμάτων, ὑπὸ Γ. Α. ΠΑΛΛΗ καὶ Μ. ΠΟΤΛΗ, ἐγκρίσει τῆς Ἀγίας καὶ Μεγάλης τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἐκκλησίας.	
4. Le Raskol : Essai historique et critique sur les Sectes religieuses en Russie.	
5. Histoire, Dogmes, Traditions, et Liturgie de l'Eglise Armenienne Orientale. Par E. Dulau-rier	224

CONTENTS OF No. CXIV.

	PAGE
ART. I.—1. 1 and 2 Victoria, c. 106; 3 and 4 Victoria, c. 86.	
2. A Bill for establishing Diocesan Courts and Courts of Appeal for the Branch of the United Church of England and Ireland in New Zealand.	
3. 3 Burns' Eccles. Law, ed. Phillimore, title 'Privileges and Restraints of the Clergy'	251
II.—1. Die Sibyllinischen Weissagungen vollständig gesammelt; nach neuer Handschriften-Vergleichung, mit Kritischem Commentare, und metrischer Deutscher Uebersetzung. Herausgegeben von Dr. T. H. Friedlieb, Professor an der Universität zu Breslau.	
2. Χρησμοὶ Σιβυλλιακοί Oracula Sibyllina: Textu ad Codices MSS. recognito: Malanis supplementis aucto: cum Castalionis versione innumeris pæne locis emendatâ, et, ubi opus fuit, suppletâ: Commentario perpetuo: Excursibus et Indicibus. Curante C. Alexandre.....	277
III.—1. History of the Life and Times of Edmund Burke, By Thomas Macknight. Vol. III.	
2. Recollections and Private Memoirs of Washington. By his adopted son, George Washington Parke Custis	297
IV.—Life and Letters of John Angell James	319
V.—The Pilgrim: A Dialogue on the Life and Actions of King Henry the Eighth. By William Thomas, Clerk of the Council to Edward VI. Edited, with Notes from the Archives at Paris and Brussels, by J. A. Froude, Author of the 'History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Death of Elizabeth'	346
VI.—1. Peaks, Passes, and Glaciers. By Members of the Alpine Club. Edited by John Ball, M.R.I.A. F.R.S. Fifth Edition.	
2. Vacation Tourists, and Notes of Travel in 1860. Edited by Francis Galton, M.A. F.R.S.	
3. A Guide through the District of the Lakes. Fifth Edition. By William Wordsworth.....	361
VII.—Les Juifs en France, en Italie et en Espagne. Par J. Bédaride, bâtonnier de l'ordre des avocats à la cour impériale de Montpellier	381
VIII.—1. Gams: Geschichte der Kirche im 19 Jahrhundert. Tom. I. II.—2. Universalgeschichte der Christlichen Kirche. Lehrbuch für akademische Vorlesungen. Von Dr. Johannes Alzog, ordentl. Prof. der Theologie, an die Universität Freiburg in Breisgau. Siebente Auflage.—3. Zustände der	

Kathol. Kirche in Schlesien. Von M. A. Theiner	
—4. Kirchengeschichte der Schweiz unter der Römer-, Burgunder-, und Allemannenherrschaft. Von Dr. E. F. Gelpke.—5. Письма оъ исторіи Церковъ и Воаракъ. Соч. А. Гильеердунга.—	
6. Guia del estado eclesiastico para el año de 1848. Por D. Primitivo Fuentes.—7. Heylige en Roemweerdige Persoonen &c. in geheel Nederland, &c. Door C. Smet, Priester. 4 voll.—	
8. Das ordens religiosas em Portugal. Por Pedro Diniz.—9. Historia Ecclesiastica Islandiæ, ab anno 1740 ad annum 1840. Auctore P. Pétursson, Toparchiæ Snaefellnesensis et Hnappadalensis præposito.—10. Den Danske Kirkes Historie efter Reformationen. Ved Ludwig Helweg.—11. Riancey : La Liberté de l'Eglise et la Persécution religieuse dans le Grand Duché de Bade.—	
12. Lang : Die oberrheinische Kirchenprovinz.—13. Kirche und Staat nach Ablauf der Kölner Irrung. Von J. Von Gorres.—14. Stoeveken : Clemens August [von Droste] in seinem Leben, Wirken und Tode.—15. Concordat in Bayern.—	
16. Doctrine de Saint Simon.—17. Artaud : Histoire de Léon XII.—18. Paroles d'un Croyant.—19. Bautain : Réponse d'un Chrétien aux Paroles d'un Croyant.—20. Bulau : Geschichte Deutschlands von 1806 bis 1830.—21. Polska w Kstalcie Dykcyonarza historyczno-statystyczno-geograficznego. Opisana przez Jędrzeja Słowaczynskiego	408

ART. IX.—1. Chronicles of the Ancient British Church previous to the Arrival of S. Augustine. Second Edition.	
2. S. Paul in Britain ; or, the Origin of British as opposed to Papal Christianity. By the Rev. R. W. Morgan.	
3. The Cave in the Hills, or Cæcilius Viriathus—Wild Scenes among the Celts—The Alleluia Battle ; or, Pelagianism in Britain ; being Nos. I. V. and XIV. of Messrs. Parker's ' Historical Tales.'	
4. The Celt, the Roman, and the Saxon: the History of the Early Inhabitants of Britain down to the Conversion of the Anglo-Saxons to Christianity. By T. Wright, M.A. F.S.A.	
5. De Ecclesiasticæ Britonum Scotorumque Historiæ Fontibus disseruit Carolus Gulielmus Schöll	441
X.—The English Cathedral of the Nineteenth Century. By A. J. B. Beresford Hope, M.A. D.C.L.	466

NOTICES OF BOOKS	496
------------------------	-----

THE
CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER.

JULY, 1861.

ART. I.—*History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Death of Elizabeth.* By JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE, M.A. late Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford. Vols. V. VI. London: John W. Parker and Son, West Strand. 1860.

MR. FROUDE, in his earlier volumes, treated of the caprices of an imperious will, not perhaps creating, but certainly accelerating new forms of circumstances: in these later ones, his task is to describe the caprice of circumstances themselves carrying the nation and its rulers along with them. Henry imagined that still, after his death, might be maintained the same unnatural waiting of passions and intellectual moods upon the statesman's will, which had arisen in his lifetime from a peculiar constitution of things abroad and at home which no longer existed. In the body of executors named by him, the parties of reaction and progress were both represented, but with an elimination of names of men like Gardiner, so able and determined as to be likely to gain a decided predominance for their own views. He desired to leave the country politically Protestant, but doctrinally alternating between Rome and Geneva, at least till his successor should be old enough to carry belief on or back.

The brother of Jane Seymour, the Earl of Hertford, better known as Duke of Somerset, had at all events no authority from him to take upon himself sovereign power. That nobleman might have been excused had he by experience found it practically impossible to control a nation over which the anarchical tide of intellectual development or agitation was rushing, unless the sole power was committed to one hand; but, as it was, without giving himself or his colleagues any time to test the justice of such an anticipation, within a few minutes after the monarch's death, he was employed in trying to gain over Paget to concur in his usurpation of sovereign power. His vain ambition after no long time brought on its own punishment; and so entirely without pretext had been its exhibition, that no reader of the history of the Protectorate can feel pity for

Somerset to be a matter of right. Yet compassion for his fate will not be the less fully conceded on that account.

Mr. Froude himself, in his narrative of the period, seems to be influenced by this sort of inconsistency: his account of the Duke of Somerset's actions necessitates his condemnation; yet, along with the promulgation of the sentence, is ever an under-current of sympathy with the offender. A man of strong will is likely never to be judged impartially. If he be a sovereign the probability becomes almost certainty: his will is sure to have indented the age with a print to be traced through all the folds of intervening ages, and to have given his period an impulse either in accordance with his efforts, or displaying the energy of repulsion, which may still be felt. We now are influenced by the spirit of the constitution of which William III. was the hero, and of the modification of religious system fashioned by Henry VIII.; and English historians can accordingly never describe even the positive actions of these kings but as controversialists rather than as inquirers. In the history of Henry's reign the reader seems to be ever being challenged to opposition by the argumentative tone of the writer; and there is always lurking in his mind a suspicion, destructive of all hope of profit from the book, that, though the State papers cited have been accurately and truthfully sifted, an investigation commenced with a contrary prepossession might elicit precisely contrary results. But Somerset's character and fortunes are neutral ground; had he never existed the state of England would, by the reign of Elizabeth, have probably been much the same as it actually then was, and consequently no private prepossession in favour of his individual character involves a partisan view of the acts in which he was engaged. He is described as endued with some ability as a general, but of the smallest talents for statesmanship; of great ambition, but without either great genius or great energy to justify its excesses. In addition, his disposition, we are told, was amiable, his intentions often noble, and his misfortunes tragic. In short, his is just that kind of character which offers no temptation to the historian to eulogise unduly, and of which the weaknesses were so co-ordinate with, and relative to the virtues, and both to the man's fate, and actual position in history, that the tenderness of treatment which may be conceded to it is sure not to rouse a contrary prejudice.

In fact, Somerset may have had many splendid qualities, which would have ensured him an eminent rank in a king's court, in which he was not to be the chief administrator. It was his misfortune that, while the times required a much more masculine and inflexible spirit, his rank among Henry's executors had almost forced him to grasp at the supremacy which

the confusion of the times made it necessary to devolve upon one man, and which his recollection of the bold dogmatic way in which the late king had exercised his power induced him, with a title and abilities so conspicuously inferior, to attempt to use in the same despotic manner. Only mighty genius could have carried to a successful issue so audacious a *coup d'état* as that by which the Protector established his authority at the first, or saved from a disgraceful fall the vanity which led him to write to kings as an equal. His good fortune itself, at the commencement of his administration, as it tempted him to encroachments, so made his downfall the more humiliating. At first circumstances were most favourable in appearance. The Emperor Charles V. rejected the Pope's advice to claim the crown of England for his cousin Mary; and at home the chancellor Wriothesley, ever a fierce opponent, himself gave occasion for expulsion from his office, and, consequently, from the council. The relations with France alone were threatening, the Protector's new fortifications at Boulogne, and in Scotland, France's old ally, affording but too fair a pretext for hostilities. For domestic matters, no sooner was the Protector firmly established, than the violent reformers were permitted, and almost encouraged, to carry out their favourite innovations. In vain did Gardiner, who, Mr. Froude somewhat ungenerously intimates, only when in a minority understood the merits of moderation, entreated Somerset not 'to trouble the realm with novelties,' at least during Edward's minority; and taunted Ridley with railing at holy water and images with 'light rash eloquence.' The destructive propensity is always strong in men; it now, freed from the hard determination of the late sovereign, began to rage among the populace; it raged even in the Protector's heart. Painted glass and frescoes were destroyed by the order of the Government; and even bakers and brewers, smiths and shoemakers, were forbidden their special holy days. Well now might the proud noble think himself a worthy successor to the sway of Henry. Following that monarch's example, he was issuing ecclesiastical commissions, and curbing the pride of bishops; and this domestic campaign was close followed by a gigantic invasion of Scotland, headed by himself, and a triumphant return after the great victory of Pinkie Cleugh.

Nevertheless, a black cloud of discontent was rising over the whole country. There was much show of exactitude in small religious distinctions, but little of the reality; and men, like Latimer, foretold retribution for the desolating selfishness which had crept over all things. It might have been a shorter, or it might have been a longer interval, before the consequences of

this national malady affected the Protector; but, sooner or later, he was sure to be made the scapegoat, and not altogether unjustly. He had thrust himself into a position to which he had no natural right; and, when possessed of the virtual sovereignty, he ruled, with a vague theory of policy indeed in view, but no practical, industrious statesmanship in choosing means or instruments. Mr. Froude undoubtedly does not unfairly colour Somerset's acts, to extract therefrom a conclusion favourable for him; but he does appear to have a tenderness for him, which leads him unduly to exalt kindly instincts which, when so entirely undeveloped as in this case, are vices rather than virtues in statesmen. It is, indeed, hard, in reading accounts of wars with Scotland, acknowledged by the historian to have been without rational aim or result; of the usurpation of powers not delegated by any legitimate authority; of rash grasping at church-lands; tampering with the coinage, and the building of a sumptuous palace;—to discover much occasion for eulogy. The man's character, in short, does not appear so very different in essential particulars from that of the rapacious herd of courtiers. He did not delight in hanging 'sturdy valiant beggars;' but in his rivalries with other nobles, he was not more generous than they. Wriothesley, and the Protector's hapless brother, Lord Seymour, and Gardiner, found him relentless enough. Dudley himself, bad and unscrupulous as he was, may have been justified in his revenge by his victim's confession, that murderous projects had been, in fact, entertained by himself. Mr. Froude urges often the partisanship manifested by the duke in favour of the commonalty, and the expressions of his indignation against the covetous aristocracy. What he does not make so clear is, whether or no all this popular demeanour were not assumed by him from selfish ambition. When menaced by the council, he did not shrink from trying to provoke a sort of servile insurrection, or from strange threats, that he would involve his king in his own destruction. When fallen from power, and with the chieftainship of the Protestant party stolen from him by the Dudleys, he began to intrigue cautiously with Mary, and with the Conservative—even with the Catholic—party. One may pity his misfortunes; but he is hardly one who had a right to reproach his countrymen with ingratitude. Men worse—abundantly worse—than he there were; but neither in him—though with an attractive, popular easiness in his temperament, and capability of acquiescing with satisfaction in the happiness of others while he was himself in prosperity—does there seem to have been anything at all of the spirit of self-sacrifice. In the eyes of Mr. Froude, however, the fact of having held supreme power, unless it were attained by direct usurpation

from some one with a better legal right, furnishes always a strong presumption in a great man's favour. Resistance to such is a matter which it needs no laborious weight of evidence to prove to his satisfaction to be criminal. It is not so much an overweening love of authority which induces this conclusion, for this is scarcely the sort of disposition of which we should presuppose the existence in our historian; we believe it rather to be a dislike to the common, and often morbid propensity to lament over the downfall of men of a former age, in whose destruction, if we had been their contemporaries, we should in all probability have exulted. From this inclination to assail the accusations alleged against bygone State-prosecutions, it is but a short step to defend the prosecutors. The foolish tenderness, delighting in accusing the hardness of others, but with but a very shadowy connexion with active tenderness, which is wont to inveigh with the same harshness against the destruction of a Buckingham as of a Thomas More, and to assail first Somerset for slaying his brother, and then Dudley for putting Somerset to death, is the provocative of Mr. Froude's semi-latent partisanship. Because he finds superabundant evidence against Seymour and Dudley, he is tempted to claim a verdict in favour of the Protector, whereas he and his rivals were all alike guilty.

As one great error of these charming volumes, as of their predecessors, is their author's disposition for explaining the ill fortune of one man by the superior virtue of another, in opposition to the popular view of human events which represents all historical personages of old times as either victims or tyrants, so another defect is the tendency absolutely to interpret one part of a man's life by another. Thus the noble arguments and denunciations of Bishop Gardiner are not indeed suppressed, but accompanied ever by a running commentary, which, contrasting the pleas for moderation of the future Prime Minister of Queen Mary with his subsequent harshness to men whose views differed from his own, is meant apparently to induce in the reader a suspicion of insincerity on the part of the prelate. Gardiner's character is perhaps rather obscure to us: we can only guess out its phases. But when some aspects of a great man's career are culpable and others laudable, it is surely fairer to give due weight to both, than—which is at the same time the usual, and, in some measure, the natural result—to endeavour to account for the one as but the other in disguise. Political and religious opinions were at this period, as at many other epochs in English history, jumbled together inextricably. There were but few men who, like Sir T. More, could act uprightly and honestly at once in matters of politics and of religion,

not letting their views of the one be distorted by those of the other. Not such a statesman, not such a Christian, perhaps, was Gardiner; but, nevertheless, there was something generous and high-minded in his conceptions both of statesmanship and of religion. The student of history feels somewhat discouraged when he finds propounded as the exceptions to the profligacy of the times the cold sagacity of Paget and Cecil, and the headstrong vanity of Somerset, who was building sumptuous palaces while pretending to bemoan the sufferings of the poor whom the Church lands he grasped at so covetously might have effectually relieved; it is some consolation to mark that Gardiner, while refusing to purchase restoration to the council, where he must soon have been pre-eminent, by pledging his belief to what he thought wrong, yet bore, while in disgrace and in prison, to address frank, but not unfriendly advice and warnings to the ministers whose work his sufferings were. Gardiner was too much of a politician; he had been too thoroughly imbued with the experiences of Henry's sycophant Court to be a hero; but he was a thoughtful, and not unpatriotic Englishman, not disposed to thrust himself into martyrdom, but, at the same time, not ready to forfeit self-respect for the purpose of avoiding it. A certain length he was willing to be dragged, protesting all the way, but beyond that no threats and no punishments could force him. He proved a sagacious Minister under Henry VIII. Had he held the same relative position in Protestant views that he did in Catholic ones, and flourished in Elizabeth's reign, he would probably have gained a reputation even exceeding that of Cecil. It was his evil fate to have endured oppressions to a great degree quite unjustifiable and unprovoked at the hands of Edward's Protestant advisers, and then to have regained power at the moment of Catholic reaction. He was a Conservative, though not naturally a bigoted one, with a keen feeling of the ludicrous and absurd in enthusiasm; and the scenes of misery and national disgrace, the fruits of an intemperate spirit of innovation in the reign of Edward, had produced their result in his deliberate, unimpassioned assent to the impassioned determination of the succeeding sovereign to restore, at all events, the old state of things.

We have less difficulty in subscribing to Mr. Froude's praise of Paget than to his depreciation of Bishop Gardiner. Sir William Paget is manifestly one of his favourites. He was a clear-sighted, keen minister, and, with that great virtue in the historian's eyes, the habit, partly the result of temperament, and partly of circumstances, of going, not from sordid obsequiousness, but with his own free and candid assent, with the tide. It was by his help, though not at his instigation, that Somerset

assumed the Protectorate ; it was with his consent, and in consequence of continued disobedience to his wise injunctions, that that noble was deposed from his pre-eminence, Honours and wealth rather came to, than were solicited by him ; and even the foes of his policy, like Seymour, had opportunities of profiting by his prudent and kindly counsels. When danger came, he was ever ready to offer advice, the best under the circumstances ; he never intrigued to secure himself when his immediate friends fell ; and he escaped persecution—except during the period of Dudley's sway—because there was never anything in his character, and therefore in his conduct, to provoke it. Perhaps there is no statesman so conspicuously respectable in the reigns of the Tudors as Paget ; he saw so clearly into men's characters, he judged so wisely of circumstances ; but, at the same time, there is nothing in him to challenge vehement admiration, or inspire affection. His functions were those of a Greek chorus, chameleon-like, through whose moods and aspects the features and colours of the surrounding scene are shadowed out.

Mr. Froude's representation of the rest of the statesmen of the time we believe a just one. They were, with scarcely an exception, of the courtier type which had succeeded to effete feudalism. One cares but little for the fate of men like Lord Seymour of Sudley, whose only excellence was courage. Yet the numerous vices of such personages as these do not excuse the illegal measures taken by their political rivals against them. Still less do they excuse a defence for their perpetrators, like that quoted with approbation by Mr. Froude from one of Bishop Latimer's sermons. There the preacher, 'assuredly,' the historian is justified in exclaiming, 'no sycophant of Government,' yet perhaps not therefore the less disposed to treat of the rules of law as unjust clogs on the exertion of force against those whose existence he believed pernicious to the Commonwealth, stoutly asserts that it was equitable and proper to refuse the accused a trial, justifying his doctrine rather oddly by pointing to the instance of S. Paul, who, by being (when accused) allowed to answer for himself at Jerusalem, got nearly torn in pieces, and then, applying his example to the case of Somerset, who was, as it were, plaintiff against Seymour, to whom the right of self-defence was denied : 'When S. Paul was saved by the magistrate, being but a private man, will ye not allow that something may be done for saving of the magistrate's life ?'

The discontent of the country corresponded to the selfishness at the basis of all the intrigues and counter-intrigues of the rulers. There could be no respect for authority when it was seen that authority was used merely to protect dishonesty and covetousness. The consciousness of the national misfortunes

being traceable to their body made the council full of discontent. The Protector had arrogated power kingly all but in name, and it was natural that his colleagues should impute to him the general disorder. The rabble pretending to be reformers in the towns, the peasants breaking down inclosures in the country ; all alike affected, and not without some reason, to have been encouraged in their movements by him. These agrarian riots, or insurrections, are well described by Mr. Froude ; he possesses, like Lord Macaulay, the art of describing, not only the marches and assaults of troops, but those in relation to the natural features of the country in which they took place. It is, certainly, a pleasant surprise to come, with reminiscences of Hume's lifeless narrative full upon one, upon a spirit-stirring story, not the less true, and much the more instructive, because so picturesque, of these scenes of anarchy—a gladder spectacle, perhaps, to men who, like Mr. Froude, see, and see truly, the English spirit alive in England at all periods of its history, than would have been that of a country as ready as a court to bend to every turn of a ruler's caprice. We may think the peasants of Devonshire and those of Norfolk wrong, and equally so in their various objects ; but they, at least, fought for what they thought of public benefit, and did not intrigue for mere objects of self-interest. In his narrative we see the priest of Samford Courtenay, saying mass in Latin, the common people all the country round clapping their hands for joy ; the blazing barns of Crediton, with the bold churls behind them defying the scornful Carews ; Walter Raleigh, father of the hero of Elizabeth's reign, chiding at the old woman telling her beads, and her screaming in the church to the frenzied villagers, 'Ye must leave beads and holy water now, or the gentlemen will burn your houses over your heads ;' the Carews probing the mud of the river at Clyst, to find footing that they might dash through at the rioters, and then the rising of the whole of the West in rage and despair, and gentlemen hiding for their lives in woods and caves. Next we have an interlude of the stern insolent Bonner being bidden by the council to prove that the rebels of the West were, by their acts, 'incurring damnation ever to be in the burning fire of hell with Lucifer, the father and first author of disobedience ;' the tale of Oxfordshire rectors dangling from their church towers for presuming to refuse assent to the theses of Peter Martyr, and of strange altercations in the Council Chamber between the incapable Protector and his contemptuous advisers. Then the narrative of the rebellion is resumed with the siege of Exeter, where right gallantly the aldermen held the town against the rioters, whose demands they sympathized with, in the interests of general order, with the rash onslaught, as usual, of the Carews

at the barricade in Fennington meadows, and the culminating of the conflict at S. Mary's, Clyst. Mr. Froude is himself carried away by the spirit of his own description, and speaks of the armed insurgents against a lawful government as having the better cause; or, perhaps, his partiality for them is but as a consequence of what appears to be the fundamental conception of his history, viz. that there is an *à priori* probability in favour of the equitableness of the acts of the majority. As this theory would lead him to defend the condemnation of an Anne Boleyn by Parliament, an individual by a multitude, so it would induce in him a presumption, only less vehement, that the rising of whole counties argued (as, indeed, we believe most entirely it did) gross errors on the part of the rulers. A stormy struggle and bloody massacre on the evening of the 3d of August, took place on the heath by Topsham: 'Among the peasantry the irritation was justly turned to madness, when they knew that foreign mercenaries (viz. German lanzknechts and Italian musketeers) were brought in to crush them. Never before had English rulers used the arms of strangers against English subjects; and no sooner were their columns in sight than the villagers of Clyst rushed up in rage to fall upon them. One could wish that the better cause had found the better defenders. The half-armed Devonshire peasants were poorly matched against trained and disciplined troops. Few who went up the hill came back again; they fell in the summer gloaming, like stout-hearted, valiant men, for their hearths and altars; and Miles Coverdale, translator of the Bible, and future Bishop of Exeter, preached a thanksgiving sermon among their bodies, as they lay with stiffening limbs with their faces to the stars.' But the work was not yet done: the rebels were swarming all the night through thick into Clyst, and, six thousand strong, drew up on the village green, and lined the houses and neighbouring furze brake. At length the Italian muskets gave the victory to Russell and the regular forces, and the red dragon floated on the walls of starving Exeter. On Sunday, the 17th of August, the insurgents received their final defeat, and then so-called justice occupied the scene. It is, no doubt, likely, as Mr. Froude says, that, had the reports of Sir Arthur Kingston, who was sent as Provost-Marshal into Cornwall, survived, the account would have been different to the gloomy traditions current in the next generation of the sort of law dealt out to that country; but we fear that Sir Arthur's friendship for Bishop Hooper, which is urged by the historian as a presumption in his favour, can scarcely disprove the allegations of curt equity applied by him in the case of Catholic recusants. There is certainly intrinsic evidence of veracity in the rough

Colonel-Kirke-like humour shown in the two stories told to exemplify his method of procedure. A miller, who had been out with the insurgents, expecting inquiry, had persuaded a servant to personate him. "Are you the miller?" said Kingston, riding 'one day to his door. "If you please, yea," was the unsuspecting answer. "Up with him," said the Provost-Marshall. "He is a 'busy knave, hang him up!" In vain the poor man called out then 'that he was no miller, but an innocent servant. "Thou art a 'false knave, then," said Sir Anthony, "to be in two tales; there-'fore hang him;" and he was hanged incontinently.' The second story is of the Mayor of Bodmin, who was confidently expecting pardon through his friends' intercession, when he received a message from the Provost-Marshall that he was to entertain him at dinner. 'He had a man to hang, too,' he said, and a stout gallows must be ready. The dinner was duly eaten, and the gallows prepared. 'Think you,' said Kingston, as they stood looking at it; 'think you it is strong enough?' 'Yea, sir,' quoth the mayor, 'it is.' 'Well then,' said Sir Anthony, 'get you up, for it is for you.' And the mayor, 'greatly abashed,' had to comply, and get hanged. After these two merry acts of Sir Anthony we fear the reader will require more evidence than an acquaintance with Hooper to make him assent to the conclusion that this cold-blooded jester was, 'in some respects, a noble sort of person.'

During part of the time during which the West had been disturbed on account especially of the change in religion, the general fashion of turning arable land into sheep-farms had excited the rising at the Oak of Reformation at Wymondham, under Ket the tanner. Contemporaneously also with the final suppression of the Devonshire insurrection, the Norfolk rioters were dispersed by Dudley, Earl of Warwick, and subsequently Duke of Northumberland. The Western tumults had been provoked by changes brought about by the direct authority of the Protector; in the Eastern the demands of the peasants were at least sympathised with by him; but in neither case did he care to spoil his popularity with the multitude by taking the lead frankly and openly in restoring public order. No monarch could have been more zealous of the invasion of his prerogatives; yet he left it to others to incur the odium of performing the duties of head of the executive. The disasters in the Boullonnais filled up the measure of his fellow-councillors' discontent; the gallantry of Dudley at Norwich had now given the crowd of disaffected statesmen a chief who is one of the most remarkable personages in English history.

Mr. Froude, in his half-eulogistic blame of Somerset for his good intentions, which were 'so many that he was betrayed by

'their very number,' 'his moderate ability and immoderate ambition to do good,' and his desire to restore the golden age, seems to us to have outstripped the facts, without however suppressing any. From his own narrative we are at a loss to discover how much can be said even for the theories of a statesman who is acknowledged in prosperity to have affected state which did not belong to him, and in misfortunes to have been passionate and unmanageable, whilst, amid the ruin of the national finances, he had succeeded in amassing an immense fortune. When his rivals were the lords whose enclosures had excited the popular wrath, it is hard, in the absence of all less dubious signs of active interest in the popular welfare, to recognise much magnanimity in wordy upbraidings of colleagues who at least were ready to support *their* theories of government at their own personal and pecuniary risk. Not a single proof from deeds has been brought forward by Mr. Froude in aid of his description of the Protector's weakness as at all events *magnificent*. Mr. Froude has a decided prejudice in favour of Somerset and against his successor, Dudley; and these two feelings seem to have been exaggerated in his mind by mutual action and reaction. Dudley he portrays as unenthusiastic, silent, cunning, and plausible, with 'a tone of studied moderation, a seeming disinterestedness, a thoughtful anxiety for others. With something of the reality, something of the affectation of high qualities, with great personal courage, and a coolness which never allowed him to be off his guard, he had a character well fitted to impose on others, because, first of all, it is likely that he had imposed on himself.' In considering this character, we are beset with the same shadow of suspicion which haunts the whole of this certainly very remarkable contribution to English history. Mr. Froude is always endeavouring to clear up incongruities in character and in facts; he does not make enough account of the natural inconsistencies, often all but contradictory, in men and circumstances, still less of the power of development of one quality, forced into undue maturity by circumstances, so as gradually to coop up or drive out other and nobler ones. Because at a future time, when spoiled by the temptations of ambition, he showed but scant consideration for his contemporaries, we are not to suppose that his petition that the luckless Northampton might be continued in command over him was but *seemingly* disinterested, any more than that his courage in Norfolk, when he pledged his companions by kissing their swords that he would either conquer or die, was *unreal*, because, in the face of a whole nation in arms against him, he made no very heroic stand against the advance of Mary. Even the two acts on which his condemnation by historians is generally based—the execution of

Somerset, and the elevation of Jane Grey to the throne—may not be so very black as they are often accounted by persons who begin with a preconception of the character of him the chief actor in those matters as profoundly bad. For the first charge, Mr. Froude allows that Palmer's evidence, and, unless the young King were himself deceived, the confession (which Mr. Froude assumes, we know not on what authority, to have been before the Peers) of Somerset himself, and, subsequently, of Bertiville, who declared he had been hired to murder Dudley, go far to prove that the Duke suffered rightfully. But it is strange to observe the two-edged form in which the historian expresses his condemnation of the king's uncle: 'If it be true that Somerset confessed, either in the court or the Tower, that he had really meditated murder, he was no better than Northumberland (Dudley's new title); interest or sympathy is alike wasted upon either.' Why, if the accused were truly found guilty of such an attempt, should the rival, who had averted the blow, be compromised by having stood on his defence successfully against so foul a conspiracy? The fact, if it be a fact, that Northumberland confessed, before his own death, that through his means Somerset had been falsely accused, may perplex us in the teeth of the latter duke's contradictory confession that he had not been falsely accused; but, at least, the two incongruities should be set against each other: with no more easily reconcileable fragments of evidence it is inequitable to condemn Dudley on this point. In respect of the usurpation of the crown by Lady Jane Grey, which was unquestionably his work, there need be no contest about facts. But, when the stern persistency by Mary, most honourable as it was, in adhering to her mother's faith, is considered, and all the features of that character, whence flowed acts which made obedience to Rome ever after an impossibility in England, some plea, even on the merits of the case, may be discovered for the project. It is hardly justifiable to appeal to a plot, as positive proof of the mean utter selfishness of its author, when the direct object of that plot—and effectually, had it been successful, it would have accomplished this end—was not so much to cause as to prevent a revolution, to keep, that is, the same spirit, which, bad or good, had predominated in Edward's councils, prevalent in England. It is equally unwarrantable to argue, that, 'If the Reformation had been, as he pretended, his true concern, Dudley would have brought back Mary himself bound by conditions which in her danger she would have accepted.' What security would there have been in such engagements!

Mr. Froude's fifth volume ends with the death of Edward, the most exalted in rank of all the personages described in the

history, but of whom there are naturally but rare glimpses discernible in the narrative ; it is, perhaps, a proof of the extraordinary precocity of the young prince, that he occupies any position whatever at so early an age. Mr. Froude, though anxious to apologize for any seeming harshness in passages quoted from his letters and diary, as in relation to the death of Somerset, gives a picture of him not very different from that which other historians have presented. He would probably have made a good sovereign, careful for his subjects' welfare, but probably, also, with a narrow-minded obstinacy in adhering to his own views, the harsher, because conscientious. But the two chief figures in the narrative are Somerset and Northumberland ; and it is, perhaps, on that account that the reader leaves off, charmed, indeed, but with a not sufficiently definite idea of the period. The fault of the style of writing history fashionable in the last century is, that high politics, the marches of armies, and embassies, diversified, perhaps, with a debate in Parliament, take up the whole. Yet the reader has at the end in his mind a conception of the reign described. It is not a very full one, but the outline is clear ; the outline, perhaps, is not very correct, but it is, at all events, definite. After perusing Mr. Froude's much more graphic pages, we fancy we know the time exactly ; we have gathered so many minute particulars about individuals, we can so vividly picture to ourselves the scenes and peculiarities of an insurrection. But it is as hard to collect a general view out of these details, as it will be for future historians to compile a history of the reign of Victoria from the files of the *Times* ; the materials are here in abundance : but something of the labour and genius of a historian is needed to fuse the details, and make history out of a gazette. But, as we suggested above, the want of a central figure, the plenteousness of factions, the anarchical state in which the whole national mind was, may, perhaps, explain this felt want in a manner less derogatory to the author. Certainly it is far less, if at all, perceptible in the following volume, where the deeply-marked characters of Mary and Philip, Pole and Gardiner, and of their policy and principles of government, leave no room for doubt as to the conception of the age, and its place in the history of the world.

The epoch ushered in by blood-red hail, and the fall of church steeples was, indeed, one of a sufficiently marked character, as marked as the difference between the characters of Edward's two rival successors. There is certainly no sweeter and purer character in English history than Lady Jane Grey ; and Mr. Froude does entire justice to her piety, purity, and free, noble innocence. Virtues uncoloured, as he adds, 'even

'to a fault, with the emotional weaknesses of humanity,' do not, perhaps, excite in him as much interest as the at least sufficiently passion-tinted excellencies of Henry VIII., or the defective organization of his strange daughters; but this is not a peculiarity of Mr. Froude's: every student of the period feels the tale of Lady Jane Grey's early virtues and early calamities merely an episode, as beautiful, or more so than that of Nisus and Euryalus, or Camilla, or Pallas, in Virgil, but yet somewhat beside the real substance of the period, and the omission of which would spoil the harmony, but not the form of our history. It is, however, an episode which throws into fine relief the brief dark reign which followed. The ghastly pale face of the young, all but dead king, watching the crowd from the palace-window at Greenwich; the ill-dissembled scorn and wrath of the council compelled to sign a manifesto they thoroughly disbelieved, at the insolent dictation of the now desperate Northumberland; the courier spurring through the night to warn Mary at Hunsdon, her bold flight and arming; the vehement, even 'shrieking,' denunciation of her cause by Ridley at Paul's Cross, or Sandys' quiet saunter in the meadows of the Cam, with his hooting and hustling by the gowned rabble in the senate-house, in theory always so calm; and the self-condemnatory pusillanimity of Northumberland, as, with 'one clutch at his beard,' he threw up his cap, and shouted for Queen Mary, with the loud-voiced enthusiasm of a whole nation in the cause of the legitimate heir—form a grand archway by which to enter on a reign, not degrading to our national character, but as black and tragic as any epoch in our annals.

Mr. Froude dwells much, and rightly so, on the character of Mary, as, in fact, he ever does on the qualities and habits of mind, even on the less essential traits of the great personages in history. In these volumes he asserts that he believes individual character does exert a very great, and sometimes a permanent influence upon a people's fortunes, though, perhaps, great revolutions in opinion may be the effect of commensurately extensive and general changes in circumstances. His tone is moderate, but we should judge, from internal evidence, that his bias is as much in direction of the one extreme, as Mr. Buckle's is in that of the other. It appears to us that it is wrong either to exclude the consideration of individual character, or to consider it solely in tracing the causes of events; it must always, if there be individuals with characters sufficiently marked, be one of the aggregate phenomena which together constitute the cause. If, for instance, the general tone of thought and feeling be not gravitating very decidedly in any particular direction, the throwing into the one scale the

energy and uncompromising resoluteness of one man's character may produce an impetus which may tend to reproduce itself. Otherwise, however decided the movement in that one direction, it will scarcely be strong enough to outlast the continuous resistance in the other, unless, from the accident, if we may so speak, of individual character anew and independently coming in before the results of the previous effort have subsided, and giving a fresh momentum. Had Elizabeth held the same opinions as her sister, these two reigns, succeeded by those of the Stuarts, might have produced in England the same sort of Catholicism, by no means Ultramontane, as was later established in the Gallican Church, and which was probably the ideal vaguely floating before the eyes of Henry VIII. But such an effect could in no wise have resulted from the short, single reign of Mary. Apart from other considerations, her character, as portrayed in the sixth volume of this history, furnishes a complete explanation of the violent repulsion which ensued from her policy. During misfortune, Mary could display a bearing almost heroic. Her patient but firm persistency in refusing to conform, even outwardly, to Protestantism, contrasts favourably with the terrible pliability of faith among the courtiers of that age, and with the less rigid adherence to her opinions of Elizabeth herself. No one could have displayed a more royal demeanour than did she when a pretender aspired to usurp her rights, and her proud determination to act in accordance both with her rights and her duty brought twenty thousand armed men to her side from a jealous city in the crisis of a rebellion. When, too, her own interests alone were concerned, she knew how to temper justice with mercy. Even Northumberland she was inclined to pardon; and, except in the solitary instance of her sister, never showed anything savouring of vindictiveness. But many noble qualities were in her tainted and spoiled by an unbending obstinacy. Proudly had she preserved her independence of thought during her father's and brother's reigns, and yet without intriguing against the royal authority. She thus came to the throne with a full belief in the truth of those principles which had, she believed, conducted her to supremacy, and with the determination to require of others the same obedience which she had paid except in matters of religion, which, by a natural inconsistency, she no longer remembered to distinguish from the things in which obedience may be demanded. The nation would probably have willingly reverted to the point in belief and Church discipline where Henry had left them, but while Mary's disposition to bow the country beneath the Papal authority disgusted the people, the aristocracy were suspicious as to her intentions with respect to the old possessions of the

Church. This feeling, and the popular aversion to the Spanish marriage, were manifest enough to the queen; but, as she had never swerved from her principles to save herself from the menaces of Edward's ministers, so was she resolved upon maintaining her freedom and her plans as sovereign. With all this obstinacy, or rigidity of purpose (it was both), we find in Mr. Froude's sixth volume evidences of a curiously feminine weakness observable, indeed, but better concealed in Elizabeth's character, which contrasts conspicuously with her many masculine qualities. There is, perhaps, exaggeration, but not too much to mar the essential truthfulness of the picture, in Mr. Froude's commentary on that long-deferred and anxiously yearned-for meeting with her Spanish husband. The historian describes the prince's nervous and sharp glances round him on landing, warning us, however, that for these touches he has no authority; the stiff demeanour, the cruel rain and howling wind which followed his progress to Winchester, his instant visit, with drenched scarlet cloak and draggled plume, to the cathedral, and the strains of the *Te Deum*, prolonged till the long aisles grew dim in the summer twilight. 'Philip,' he proceeds, partly relying on facts, partly conjecturally, 'doubtless could have endured the postponement of an interview till morning; but Mary could not wait, and the same night he was conducted into the presence of his haggard bride, who now, after a life of misery, believed herself at the open gate of Paradise. Let the curtain fall over the meeting; let it close also over the wedding solemnities which followed, with due splendour, two days later. There are scenes in life which we regard with pity too deep for words. The unhappy queen, unloved, unloveable, yet with her parched heart thirsting for affection, was flinging herself upon a breast to which an iceberg was warm; upon a man to whom love was an unmeaning word, except as the most brutal of passions. For a few months she created for herself an atmosphere of unreality. She saw in Philip the ideal of her imagination, and in Philip's feelings the reflex of her own; but the dream passed away—her love for her husband remained; but remained only to be a torture to her. With a broken spirit and bewildered understanding, she turned to Heaven for comfort, and, instead of Heaven, she saw only the false roof of her creed painted to imitate and shut out the sky.' To comprehend fully her infatuation, we must remember the long persecution endured by Mary, before and after her mother's death, on account of the Spanish connexion; we must remember how she must have ever turned to Spain as her refuge and hope. To her imagination, a marriage with the Prince of Spain was an alliance, not only with the temporal head of her faith, but

with the only family which her repudiation in some sort by her father allowed her to think her own. This consideration ought, we believe, to have checked the contemptuousness, and the tone in which her love is glanced at as baseless and raving, apparent in the otherwise fine description just quoted.

Her better qualities were more conspicuous before Wyatt's rebellion. That embittered her mind against her sister and the Protestant party, with whom she had previously kept terms. But it was only when the victory was won that her meaner nature showed itself: in suppressing it, and while she was yet encompassed with dangers, she was every whit the dauntless daughter of Henry VIII. and Catherine. Mr. Froude has an especial talent for describing an insurrection. He well tells us how the Queen, without troops, money, or her subjects' love, rode with a 'studied' (though why *studied*, when all the horizon was black with clouds, we cannot say) air of dejection to the Guildhall, and there—as, with her deep, man's voice, she reminded her half-pitying, half-hostile audience, that she stood among them lawful Queen of England—won to her cause the swords of five-and-twenty thousand men. We have a fine picture of the rebel leaders: the Duke of Suffolk cowering in the hollow of an old tree in his own park at Astley, and his son buried under bundles of hay, on the one side; with their fellow-plotter, Wyatt, on the other, replying to the proclamation of a reward for his head by wearing his name in broad letters on his cap; or scaling the gatehouse of London Bridge, bidding the porter and his wife, whom he caught nodding over their fire, 'on their lives be still, and stealing along in the 'darkness to the chasm, from which the drawbridge had been 'cut away, and looking beyond the black gulf between the dusky 'mouths of four gaping cannon; and seeing, in the torch-light, 'Lord Howard keeping watch beside them,' or leading his forlorn hope gallantly through the whole great town.

Towards Mary Mr. Froude is not, in sentiment, unjust; but to Cardinal Pole he is quite intolerant. He has kind words, mingled with his censure, for the rebel peasants of Devon, and for Protector Somerset, for the insubordinate Hooper, and the bigotry of Edward and of Mary; but for the Cardinal he betrays everywhere an angry contempt. The theologian, whom Ranke speaks of with respect as a great leader of the reforming party in the Catholic Church, is regarded in these pages simply as a petulant, unreasonable fanatic, hunting after vain unrealities abhorrent to all sound minds, and a prey, moreover, to a tyrannic egotism. He feels no indulgence for the recoil of disappointment, which would naturally arise at having his recall delayed, in the heart of a man so long an exile, who had never, in the

splendour of his ecclesiastical rank, forgotten that he was an Englishman, and yet who repulsed negotiations which might have gained him a matrimonial crown in his native country. We cannot understand why, when at length permission was brought to the enthusiastic legate to return home, he should be sneered at as about to have 'his eager temperament for ever 'excited either with wild hopes, or equally wild despondency, 'now fooled to the top of its bent.' The Cardinal's mission was certainly not for the good of England; but its gravity and importance were sufficiently great to make his joy at the licence at last to enter the effect of no vain delusion. Fortunately for his readers, dislike does not mar Mr. Froude's power of description; and it is assuredly all put forth in the narrative of Pole's reconciliation of England to Rome, and the accompanying circumstances. He mentions, but without wasting time in praising it, the Cardinal's magnanimous carelessness about his own interests, and absorbing care for those of his Church, and intimates, somewhat gratuitously, that the popular welcome given to him was not to the papal legate, but the English nobleman. Then the eager catching of the anxious queen at any encouragement for her hopes of offspring, and the equally eager, but not therefore, as the historian seems to think, ridiculous ardour of hope in the returned exile, are well painted; and, still more, the final scene, when, on Saint Andrew's-day, in the dull November afternoon, before the English Parliament and the highest nobles of Spain and Flanders, Queen and King kneeling before the representative of Rome, 'in dead silence across the dimly-lighted hall, while, amidst the hushed breathing, every tone 'was audible, and at the pauses were heard the smothered sobs 'of the Queen, came the low, awful words of the absolution.'

On whom the guilt of the persecution which has made the later years of Mary's reign a byword directly lies, seems doubtful. On Bonner, by a sort of common consent, the odium of the grosser forms of cruelty has been thrown. He had not shrunk from bearing persecution himself well, though not heroically; and his rough, fierce nature, though with an occasionally glancing under-current of good nature, which, in Mr. Froude's account of him, brings to mind Judge Jeffreys, has gained for himself and his famous Coalhouse a very unenviable place in other than children's histories of England. It has not been so readily agreed who were the more statesmanlike and responsible agents in the matter. Mr. Froude considers that the crime of setting the persecution on foot rests with Gardiner, — 'vindictive, ruthless, treacherous, though in courage indomitable.' It does, in truth, appear that the illegal treatment to which the Bishop of Winchester had been subjected in the last

reign, had infused into his rather cold nature a yet more complete conviction than that felt by him in Henry's reign, that innovation ought to be, and could be, put down by force. But, as it is observed by Mr. Froude, Gardiner died; but the policy, which the multitude attributed to him as the Queen's prime minister, was still persevered in; and the historian's conclusion therefore is, not simply that it could not have been the work of that individual politician, but that it must have proceeded from some other of the sovereign's advisers. Herself he exonerates to a great degree: 'Those forlorn hours, when Mary would sit 'on the ground with her knees drawn to her face; those restless days and nights when, like a ghost, she would wander 'about the palace galleries, rousing herself only to write tear-blotted letters to her husband; those bursts of fury over the 'libels dropped in her way; or the marching in procession 'behind the Host in the London streets: these are all the signs 'of hysterical derangement, and leave little room for other feelings than pity.' To whom, then, does the charge attach of having guided and hurried on those blind passions and hopes of arousing Heaven's compassion by human sacrifices? To whom did the presiding geniuses of Lollard's Tower and Bonner's Coalhouse look for countenance? At whose door lies the death of Ridley and Latimer, and the sadder shifting to and fro of Cranmer? These were not, we are told, the fruit of Philip's bigotry; the brave Lords of the Council—those outspoken Protestants of Somerset's and Northumberland's train—so long as they could keep the ecclesiastical spoils, would not resist Catholicism; but they did not love it enough to make themselves hateful for its promotion; Bonner was but a tool, who even at times loathed his cruel office; Gardiner himself did not give the sign for the outbreak of fury, till an influence from the Flemish coast seduced him into violence. Pole, then, the historian believes, was the black spirit who, whether in the Netherlands or at Lambeth, ever led the van of the intolerant. It is startling to hear of the subtle intellect and strong sense of Gardiner having been wrought upon so strangely, by the weak enthusiast described by Mr. Froude under the name of Cardinal Pole. It is as surprising to have the mad dreamer taunted for the cowardly caution with which 'he passed by an earl and baron to take the lame, the halt, 'and the blind, the weaver from his loom, the carpenter 'from his workshop.' It surely must have escaped Mr. Froude, when he wrote this, that he had spoken of the influence of Cranmer, Ridley, and Latimer, three of the Cardinal's alleged victims, as so great, that fears of a fierce popular outbreak had retarded their trial till Philip could get clear of the English

coasts. To Pole is referred the condemnation of strings of prisoners brought in from the lanes and byways; and he ridicules the appeal to him for justice by Ferrars of S. David's. This prelate, after being imprisoned in the last reign because 'his talk was chiefly of baking and brewing,' and for such unepiscopal habits as his 'daily using whistling to his child,' and also to the seals on the rocks at Milford Haven, was now sentenced, for grave theological dogmas, in which he does not seem to have taken much more interest than another 'masculine Christian,' a great friend of Mr. Froude's, who was hanged after the Devonshire rebellion, from his own church-steeple, in full canonicals, the deer-poaching priest of Samford Courtenay, 'who gave not his head for the polling, nor his beard for the washing.' 'Ferrars,' says the historian, 'appealed to the legate; but the legate never listened 'to the prayer of heretics: his mission was to extirpate them.' In vain have preceding historians urged that Pole sometimes lifted up his voice for merciful measures: as when, on the 20th of August, 1556, he delivered from Bonner's grasp a file of three-and-twenty prisoners, led in a string in from Colchester. This, argues the historian, was done only from fear of the popular rage—a likely motive, forsooth, to have influenced so wild a mind as he imputes to Pole. In vain might be urged the unanimous protest of the Council to the jealous Pope Paul IV., against the revocation of the legate's commission: this, it seems, was but sycophancy to the Queen. In vain the fact that the Canterbury tragedies are traceable to Archdeacon Harpfield, who had the superintendence of the diocese till Cranmer's death. The archdeacon, it is said, was but the tool, as though the superior, though, it is to be confessed, legally liable, is always morally so for the harshness of a subordinate. Even his virtues are brought up against him: his character is described as irreproachable; his acts as not the effect of a cruel nature, but of a belief that a denial of Roman Catholic tenets and of the papal supremacy was the greatest crime in the catalogue of sins, and that he was the chosen instrument to check these wickednesses. His virtues, it is declared, sprang from the same stock with the defects in his nature; human instincts and genial emotions had been extinguished in him, though not his enormous vanity; and enthusiasm had usurped the place of understanding, till he was become what seems to be, in Mr. Froude's eyes, the most destructive of characters, 'the man of an idea.' Such is hardly the view which would be taken of Cardinal Pole by one who had not the phenomena of the Marian persecution to explain. It is to no professional persecutor that the words of Ranke, surely a temperate and competent judge, refer: 'This legate was Reginald Pole, acceptable equally to the Queen,

'the nobles, and the people; moderate, intelligent, and raised far above all suspicion of sordid or unworthy purposes;' or, again, those of Pope Pius IV.: 'England we might have retained with perfect ease had Cardinal Pole been supported (by Rome) in his measures.' Some evidence might be afforded even by the fact of the cancelling of his legatine powers by the great patron of the Inquisition, Paul IV.—a persecutor, such as Mr. Froude has imagined Pole to have been, would have been admired by the fierce Caraffa. But Mr. Froude loves to have a central figure upon whom to concentrate his loathing of the idea of a bad age, as Dudley was his ideal of the bad spirit which ruled in the latter days of Edward VI. Bonner was too uncouth and material for the purpose, Philip too used up a type of persecutors, and Gardiner over much of a politician: in Pole he discovers a pure, uncalculating spontaneity of persecuting, and delights to find this united with his hated 'true Ultramontanism, then and for the last time dominant in England.'

Mr. Froude's fault is in looking for an individual author of these horrors when a party was in fault. In the days of Edward the extreme Protestants had committed not a few enormities. In the days of Mary the extreme Catholics exacted a still more violent vengeance. They had certainly ringleaders; Bonner may have been one; they had been set in motion by feeling the reins by which they had been checked loosening in the hands of some eminent statesman; perhaps this must rest on Gardiner. But it is most undoubtedly perfectly gratuitous to attempt to trace a guiding influence throughout the whole duration of this storm: the impetus lasted till it had exhausted itself: it did not need, when once stirred, the promptings of a man like Pole; and of all men Pole's nature, we should fancy, was the least likely to mix itself in the coarse, material, unvisionary hopes of converting a realm in Smithfield. That he did not lift up his eloquent voice against the blind fury of his party is a charge, heavy we allow, which he must bear. But his crime is negative, not positive; he did not check the crowd, only because he never felt himself of it. What was his own business he believed he understood and could do; he left others to do their part in their own way.

The reign of Mary began in doubt and confusion; but all the perils and hazards which heralded her accession were for her glory. Never did a sovereign ascend a throne with a more apparent summons to her to mount it from the great majority of her subjects than Mary I. Never was a demise of the Crown welcomed with more general satisfaction. Her brave endurance of frowns of authority during the reigns of Henry and Edward; the gallant dash for the Crown, which was her right, on the

latter's death; her dauntless bearing throughout Wyatt's insurrection, should have been followed by other consequences than the degradation of having kindled a persecution, and lost the last English possession in France.

We shall gladly hail two fresh volumes from Mr. Froude's pen. So long as he cares to extract such glowing narratives and such pregnant *précis* of character from tedious State papers he will never be without readers, whether partizans of the positivist or of the individualizing theory of history. But we hardly think that it would be much for the benefit of historical study if the style of historical composition represented by these volumes were to supersede that of which Hallam may be taken as an example. There is certainly no reason in the nature of things why the most brilliant narratives of events should not be attended by the calmest judicial commentary on them; but the two qualities of historical composition require two different sets of intellectual qualities which are not very likely to meet in the same writer. Till the combination do come to pass we must look to other histories than those of this model for the philosophy of history. The distinctions and the relations between two ages and their essential characteristics, can never be learnt out of State papers taken singly, or from the characters of individual men however acutely sifted. These are but the materials from which the conclusion is to be got by careful induction and deduction. It is not enough to offer to the student the particulars, however abundant. Those he must certainly have; but he should also have the historian's own view propounded as collected from the whole mass of details examined, with the reasons on which it is based. Much must be taken on faith; it is impossible to give all the facts upon which the general conception was founded; only some can be furnished to suggest the nature of those not produced; it is altogether idle to bring forward a few scattered sayings or doings as proofs that such or such was the fact, when it may be that there are hundreds still not alleged which would go far to demonstrate the opposite conclusion.

ART. II.—*Memoir of Joshua Watson.* Edited by EDWARD CHURTON, Archdeacon of Cleveland. 2 Vols. London: J. and H. Parker.

THE present volumes may more strictly be regarded as a commemoration of worthies, a record of a band of brothers all acting together, all thinking the same thing, and working might and main in the same cause, than as the memoir of an individual. They constitute, in fact, a memorial of the opinions and doings of the leaders of the orthodox party, previous to the rise of the Oxford school, as it has been called, and subsequently in partial connexion with that movement. Few good Churchmen, who have made themselves a name any time in the last sixty or even eighty years, but have a place given them in this chain of fathers; and the story of these godly, zealous, and yet eminently prudent men, is an example in our later days of change and disruption, which must certainly be regarded as well-timed. Steady conviction, sensibly following out the end in view by rational, persistent efforts, is at all times pleasant to observe. It gives a sort of confidence in the stability of the right, which is now and then necessary to sustain our courage; and we believe few generations need such pictures and such lessons more than our own, who have had to trace in what, at least in retrospection, seems a short period, so many careers of early brightness, of change, and of final disappearance from the field of our vision—leaving an inevitable sense of disappointment and desertion.

As the type and representative of these peculiar qualities, Joshua Watson, the editor's main and avowed subject, stands the central figure of the group, and as such deserving of especial study. His is a name to us all, and perhaps little more than a name to our younger readers; for those who are only actors and workers, and that not on their own account, but under the shadow of a cause and a principle, are apt to live rather in their works than on men's lips and in their memories. Yet whatever the force of the impression we have retained of him, the nature of that impression will be the same in us all. Rarely, indeed, do we meet with a character of such consistency, whose whole life was such a natural sequence, so uniform in its principles, so unswerving in its course, so sustained by a fixed code of right and wrong, carried out as far as human infirmity will permit with undeviating rectitude. In him we have an illustration how the world, or we will rather say society, is affected by

an exhibition of real fidelity and trustworthiness, not as negative qualities withholding from error, but as positive, active, influential principles, accomplishing important results. There is something really startling in the confidence and sense of reliance he inspired. We are constantly struck by language held towards him by his friends, often in station, his superiors, of implicit faith in his word, his judgment, his honesty of purpose, not only as present qualities, but as of certain continuance, and always to be reckoned on. Our own experience would lead us to strong misgivings of such undoubting confidence in any creature, however highly we had reason to think of him; but really in this case there is no evidence of the trust being misplaced. None of his friends seems to have been disappointed in Joshua Watson's honesty, fidelity, disinterestedness, sincerity, and sympathy. They always depended on them, and they never seemed to fail. No doubt a pre-eminently good understanding and correct judgment are indispensable to the full public adequate exhibition of this excellence; but it was the moral element in his character which gained it such weight. He possessed that invaluable virtue, quality, habit, practice, whatever we call it, never to disappoint reasonable expectation. He was clearly something to lean upon. All his friends knew Joshua Watson would help them if he could, and do his best, not by fits and starts, but with constant care. He was never so far engrossed with schemes of his own as not to be able to turn to those of his friends, and take a subordinate, executive part. He kept an active mind under, and schooled himself to be content, not always to originate, even in his own peculiar line, and to be the patient, watchful, intelligent worker-out of plans that others set going. He was always alive to the work other people were doing, its importance, extent, ability; and, busy as he always was, was not one of those busy men who undertake so much that they think they do everything. Possessed of very strong convictions, he held these convictions in check, and kept guard over himself always to see things as they are; neither heightened by imagination nor lowered by prejudice; assuming in himself, even where least tempted, a full share of natural weaknesses, and using all proper precautions against them. Again, we note a singular guardedness never to presume, or to allow his prominence in affairs to supplant the actual heads from their due honours; and an habitual caution never to use his influence as patronage. These, amongst other qualities, which will come forward in a fuller analysis of his character, account for the extraordinary confidence it inspired, and which found expression in what often sounds extreme language.

Van Mildert writes, as Dean of Paul's, grateful for his prudent advice in the difficulty Queen Caroline threw them into:—'I never yet found you a broken reed to lean upon, and I am persuaded I never shall;' and another, 'I never have and I never shall be disappointed in you.' The widowed Mrs. Rose, after long experience, calls him the source of help that has never yet failed her; and the Canadian Bishop Inglis, in a flight of enthusiasm on hearing of Joshua Watson's illness, writes:—'His name, his bare existence on our planet, is something. Yea, it is hope, and strength, and power.' We are not commending such an abandonment to an idea as these last words imply; but it is something that no rude shock ever came to change the tone and throw contempt on this hyperbolical eulogy.

Joshua Watson's birth and training were, we believe, especially friendly to the development of his characteristic excellences. His father was the younger son of a Cumberland statesman, as the class of landed yeomen are called in that county, and had very early expressed the wish to become a clergyman, a desire which his father somewhat angrily repressed. Checked in this first aspiration he could not settle at home, but set off in his seventeenth year to make his fortune in London. Here he got a situation as shop-boy, of ten pounds a year, from which he rose gradually till, ten years later, he was successfully established as a wine merchant on Tower Hill. But his first tastes had not deserted him, and those who knew him in old age felt that he would have adorned the profession he had so early marked out for himself. He married Dorothy Robson, sister of the then master of Sherborne Hospital, Durham, by whom he had two sons; John James Watson, afterwards rector of Hackney and of Diggeswell, Herts, and Archdeacon of S. Alban's; and Joshua, the subject of this memoir, born on Ascension Day, May 9, 1771.

'When he (Mr. Watson), had lived to see the wish which he had so earnestly cherished for himself fulfilled in the elder of his two sons, and the younger was able to take the more active part of his share in the city business, he withdrew by degrees from the occupation of the counting-house, and made his residence in the suburban village of Homerton, near the spot on which the newly-founded church of St. Barnabas now stands. Here he lived till the death of his wife in A.D. 1812; when, yielding to the affectionate request of his children, he consented to make his abode alternately with them, passing the summer months at Diggeswell, and the winter at Clapton. At Clapton, at the house of his younger son, when he had completed his eighty-second year, and increasing infirmity had prevented any further removal, he died on the 12th of August, 1821.

'Those who remember the father of Joshua Watson, describe him as a man of the simplest habits; one who, though not slothful in business, and rather distinguished for the prudent foresight which is necessary to conduct a merchant's business to success, retained to old age the trustful heart and affectionate spirit of childhood. . . . He left behind him in the words of Bishop Van Mildert, at his most tranquil and Christian-like departure, "an example of

blameless excellence;" from which his son, who had ministered to his declining years "with a sort of devotional delight and satisfaction, derived much in the formation of his own character" while his aged parent lived, and still more in the recollection and imitation of his virtues."

'To these testimonies it may now be added, that, from papers which he left behind, it appears that several years before his death he divided his property between his two sons, reserving to himself a moderate annual allowance for personal expenses, of which, however, he gave away three-fourths in gifts and benefactions.'—Vol. i. pp. 7—9.

While his elder son carried out his own earliest ideal, he designed that the younger should assist him in the labours of his second choice, and gave him education suited to this destination. While John James was sent to the Charterhouse, Joshua was kept at a private school till thirteen. There, however, he acquired the rudiments of classical education under his master's son, a Cambridge graduate. He was afterwards removed to a city school to learn, with other merchants' sons, the mysteries of accounts, book-keeping, and such an acquaintance with continental languages as a year's study could impart; and when scarcely fifteen he was taken into his father's counting-house in Mincing Lane. Under these apparent disadvantages, he contrived in the course of years to acquire a considerable amount of classical and general knowledge. His tastes were always sound and grave. As a school-boy, Josephus had been his favourite, even stolen study, while a turn for romance was indulged by pouring over *Cassandra*, one of those wonderful prolix old tales which are beyond the powers of our feeble modern digestion to get through. He spent 50% his father gave him for books, in a selection of historians and poets, with which he made himself well acquainted, and so far cultivated his judgment, taste, and perception, that his learned and more highly educated friends were subsequently very glad to apply to him for advice and friendly criticism. In the midst of a busy career he seems to have been a reader, with the advantage of a very strong and retentive memory; and in writing he had an easy ready style, which perfectly expressed what he wanted to say. Thus he did not suffer in any sense from what is called a defective education, while we have always believed that a training in a merchant's counting-house, the familiarity-with large interests and large sums gained there, tends, under favourable circumstances, such as Joshua Watson would possess with his father, to forming a liberal and generous spirit. We think all persons whose business it is to collect money, to persuade others to give of their substance in an exceptional, profuse, extensive fashion, will say that merchants, bankers, and persons connected with trade in some way or other, have the most munificent notions of giving. While the virtues of integrity and honesty have a

chance of being studied in a wider, more thoughtful, and intelligent spirit, where buying and selling is the business of life, and there are constant questions brought before the conscience, than when the practice of them is taken for granted, and the mind is never tried with difficult and knotty points. People often fail in high-minded, unselfish honesty, from ignorance, and from a notion founded on this consciousness of ignorance, that they must be on their guard; look after themselves, and so forth. Women, from this cause, often show to disadvantage in business transactions. The same has been said of clergymen, with perhaps some truth, and for a like reason; assuming themselves professionally removed from danger of sin in this direction. A story is told in these memoirs of William Stevens, one of the chain of devoted laymen from Evelyn and Nelson, up to Joshua Watson, whose education and calling were also mercantile, which bears on this point. Hearing a young lady in whom he was interested boast to some of her female acquaintances of a cheap bargain which she fancied she had made, 'O, yes,' said Stevens, 'you are fit to live in the world.' From any one else, says the narrator, the speech would have gone for one of little meaning; but from him, who, as she was well aware, was one who detested all craft and covetousness, it came with heart searching power. His acquaintance with trade had led him to analyse all the injustice and even dishonesty involved in cheap bargains, and in the craving after them. We have no doubt that Joshua Watson's earliest training for his various and important trusts was not only excellent as giving him a perfect knowledge of business and accounts, but as cultivating his conscience, showing him where lie the pitfalls of temptation, giving him higher ideas of the duties and responsibilities connected with money, and a clearer perception of fairness and justice where the rights of others are concerned.

He had been admitted his father's partner when of age, and evidently showed talents for business; for on his father's retirement, he was, about the year 1810, sought out by a firm in Mark Lane, and requested to become partner in their concern; where, chiefly by executing government contracts, a sort of traffic which from all accounts craved wary walking, he made the whole of his fortune, and in 1814 retired, at the age of forty-three, while this fortune was continually increasing, to devote himself to the public labours of charity and benevolence which already engaged much of his time and interest. The following extract from a letter to a subordinate in his own and his father's business, written some years after this event, shows a scrupulous conscience always alive to the temptation of buying and selling, and bears on what we have been saying:—

'I have no taste or talent for preaching; but the occasion leads me to add a hope that the just view you took of the dangers and difficulties of the life from which you were withdrawing, will become clearer and stronger as you are more and more removed from their influence. Whilst engaged in all the hurry and bustle of business, and in a daily struggle perhaps for the very being of one's family, many an iniquity in buying and selling is lost sight of in the dust our own contentions raise about us, which, when we are away from the field of action, will begin to shew itself in its true light. Many a thing, which perhaps the custom of trade never allowed one to scruple about, or which the arts of competitors in a market seemed to make a necessary part of self-defence, may then possibly appear in more questionable colours. I know pretty well the temptations to which your mercantile career from its commencement to the present hour has exposed you. In my own case I rejoiced when "the snare was broken;" and I can truly add that the wish to make my escape, and to be secure against the risk of being "again entangled therein and overcome," prevailed much in my early retirement from the profits of Mark Lane, which, however they have since failed, were certainly at the time not a little tempting.

'You will not wonder, therefore, if, though late, and under different circumstances as *your* change is made, it still seems a subject of congratulation; for though without doubt every state and condition has its own peculiar temptations and trials, yet those with which one's own experience has made one most conversant must always make the strongest impression. . . . You will however, I trust, excuse it, and not think I am taking too much upon me if, at such a time and under such circumstances, I add in conclusion an earnest intreaty, that before you are plunged again into new cares, in your entry on a new and untried state of life, you would fairly and honestly examine into the past, and judging yourself by very different rules than the world prescribes, give thanks whenever you have overcome the temptations to which your condition exposed you, and repent wherever they have surprised or been an overmatch for you.'—Vol. i. pp. 144—146.

This is certainly an excellent state of mind in which to enter on the charge and distribution of other people's money, which was one of Joshua Watson's especial vocations, a charge so often broken, through carelessness, and an absence of a fit sense of responsibility, by persons who assume in themselves the nicest sense of honesty and honour; the more exact and stainless from never having been soiled by trade and the habit of bargaining. A very exact order in keeping papers and accounts was part of this conscientiousness. Indeed, as an accountant, he seems to have been unrivalled. The editor especially adduces the case of the national subscription for the German States, that had suffered under the desolating campaigns of the last years of Napoleon.

'The great misery which prevailed in those districts of Germany had at an early date in the year suggested a plan for its relief. An association was formed with great energy and liberality in the City of London, to which Joshua Watson was a subscriber, and had a seat at the board by which its funds were administered. But he was not content without a further extension of the benefit, under more direct religious influence. He went to Archbishop Mannes-Sutton, and represented to him that it was due to the honour of the Church of England in the eyes of Europe that she should not be left behind in such a work of mercy, and at such a time. The Archbishop answered his

appeal as he was wont to do; he would consent to originate a subscription in Westminster, if Mr. Watson would manage the details. Eventually it was arranged that Mr. Watson should be secretary, with the assistance of Mr. Ackermann, an intelligent native of the fatherland. The plan prospered, and was forwarded by many most influential persons. A king's letter was obtained for a collection in the churches, and Parliament made a grant of 100,000*l.* payable to the Archbishop. But Archbishop Sutton had so great a dread of becoming a public accountant, that he would almost have declined the trust, had not Joshua Watson again come to his assistance, and made such an arrangement with the Bank of England as relieved him from the toil of figures and calculations. By a skilful co-operation with local committees formed on the Continent, the disbursement and distribution of the money was so managed, that Sir George Rose, who was so long conversant with the business of the Treasury, declared that no such specimen of clear and exact accounts as this had ever come under his eye.—Vol. i. pp. 152, 153.

The expenses of distributing more than a hundred thousand pounds, in two hundred and eleven gifts, to foreign committees were less than a hundred pounds. We do not wonder, therefore, at the Archbishop's hearty thanks to such an ally when the business was over, or at the congratulations from all concerned at the 'brilliant finish' of his labours. Indeed, an impression was made on Manners Sutton, which leads to the implicit reliance on Joshua Watson's judgment he ever after shewed, and even to a more tangible proof of regard; for when, during the panic of 1826, it was reported that Joshua Watson was a large sufferer, the Archbishop urgently pressed upon him pecuniary assistance. Help was not needed, and the offer was declined with grateful thanks. His own private property had indeed been in some degree involved in the general crash, but the funds of all the societies were in safe keeping; nor were his own means for wide and liberal benevolence and almsgiving permanently lessened. We have been led first to dwell upon these business-like qualities as forming the foundation of his influence, without which he could not have taken the stand he did in church affairs; but they occupy a very subordinate part in the memoir, which enters at once into the long catalogue of clerical friendships formed early in life, and which at once proved and strengthened the natural bias of his tastes and sentiments.

His brother John James Watson's first curacy was under Jonathan Boucher, vicar of Epsom, a schoolfellow of their father's, who had subsequently gone to America, become tutor to Washington, and on his ordination taken preferment in Maryland, from which he was ejected for his bold unflinching loyalty at the time of the revolution. It was Joshua Watson's frequent practice to go down to his brother from Saturday to Monday, and he soon won not only the good Rector's regard, but such a share of respect for 'the remarkable judgment and discerning powers' he already detected in his

young friend, that he used to ask him to revise his sermons for him. There he became acquainted with William Stevens, the cousin of Bishop Horne, the friend of Jones of Nayland, and the guardian of the Church's interests, in the last half of the eighteenth century. He especially devoted himself to ameliorating the condition of the poorer clergy, and befriending their widows and children; and was the supporter of the Clergy Orphan School—a charge which Joshua Watson inherited from him in after years. He too formed a high opinion of his young friend's sagacity; for, after recording some of Stevens' good deeds, we read,—

'Those who knew the subject of our memoir in his riper age will be able to imagine with what sympathy of feeling he must have conversed with the good elder, who could with such refinement of Christian kindness direct the hand of charity. But while there can be no doubt that the example contributed much to fix the aims of the younger of this pair of friends, there was also something in the early-matured judgment and well-directed energy of Joshua Watson, which Stevens viewed with indulgent admiration; so that when he entered the room where older heads were assembled, the old man would say in his peculiar tone of mirthful earnest, "Here comes Joshua, the first man of the age."

'In one point it is believed that the same early judgment withheld him from an entire assent to the views of these aged friends. Bishop Horne, Jones, and Stevens, and most of their theological allies, were Hutchinsonians. Jones, in particular, defended the Hutchinsonian principles with some rigour; and he was not without the zealous support of some younger disciples.'—Vol. i. pp. 38, 39.

And from this the Editor passes on to a statement of Hutchinson's opinions, and his 'jealousy of what is called Natural Religion.'

The sketch given of Stevens' life and death, the consistency of his course from youth to old age, is in remarkable analogy with Joshua Watson's. With him, no doubt, good example would have the weight it is designed to have; it would assist him in marking out a course for himself—so far, that is, as such a deliberate process is possible to a practical mind; and there was in him no tendency to impulse and sudden change of plan, to disturb a preconceived ideal.

It is pleasant to be reminded, as Mr. Churton's book reminds us, of a race of worthies whose names live still in pious memories and in particular associations, and to find in what is called the 'dead age' examples of zealous religion, of warm-hearted charity, of tender, devoted friendship; all tinged by the age in which they showed themselves, and by touches of wit, humour, and poetry, characteristic of the English soil in which they grew. There is something particularly hearty in all we hear of Jones of Nayland, whether in connexion with his friend Glasse or Stevens; and a young man must be said to have begun his religious life under favourable auspices who was admitted to a circle so genuine, so simple in their lives, single in their aims,

and vigorous in their intellects, as we feel this society to have been. That they made a deep impression on young and congenial minds is evident from the school they formed, carrying on the same traditions and animated by the same spirit and perseverance.

A chapter is devoted to Joshua Watson's contemporaries—those who started the same race with him, and whose names are still associated with his own. All these were first introduced to him through his elder brother, between whom and himself existed through life the closest fraternal affection and community of interests, leading to constant unreserved intercourse; so that the intimacy of childhood, instead of waning, as it often does, with years, grew a stronger, more confidential bond as every year passed by. Sir John Richardson, in looking back on the origin of their friendship, speaks of having been first recommended, as an undergraduate, by the Master of University College, to cultivate the acquaintance of John James Watson, who soon after introduced him to his father, mother, and younger brother. The elder brother possessed one of those urbane, generous tempers that are happy in others' success; and his own zealous discharge of the sacred office to which he was dedicated would indeed act on his brother as a call of God to himself—as a claim on all the family to a particular devotion to the Church in which one of them was called to minister. Another friend, Thomas Sikes, of Guilsborough, in Northamptonshire, who lives still in many a recollection, was calculated to influence his opinions, though no doubt his natural bias was in the same direction. Mr. Sikes was a born controversialist; no one could listen to his eager flow of argument without regarding him as the type of a class. He began this course early; for, being first placed at St. Edmund's Hall, Oxford, he presently found the views, for so many years identified with that Hall, so opposed to his convictions, that he removed to Pembroke College, where he took his B.A. 1788, while Joshua Watson was still in his eighteenth year. It was Thomas Sikes who prophesied of the confusion in the Church that would follow on the revival of certain doctrines too long kept out of sight: 'Our confusion, now-a-days, is chiefly owing to the want of asserting this one article of the Creed (the Holy Catholic Church); and there will be yet more confusion attending its revival, when it is thrust on minds unprepared, and on an uncatechized Church.' This friendship was cemented by Joshua Watson's union with his sister, Mary, daughter of Thomas Sikes, Esq., banker, in Mansion-house Street, and niece of Charles Daubeney, Archdeacon of Sarum, which took place June, 1797, in his twenty-seventh year.

'With this excellent and highly-gifted woman he lived for thirty-four years in happy union, finding in her an admirable counsellor in the best aims of his life, entire sympathy with his thoughts on matters of duty, and a vigorous intellect, which attracted many minds of the first order to the social meetings of the clergy and laity under his roof. In the private diary of the year 1817, noticing the twentieth anniversary of his wedding-day, he adds the words, *Ter terque beatus*.

'Of the issue of this marriage one daughter only lived beyond childhood; their first-born son, Joshua Barnston, and an infant, Henry, both dying in the year 1802.'—Vol. i. pp. 15, 16.

Another still more familiar name is early associated with Joshua Watson's, and continues to be so through these volumes—that known to us as 'Norris of Hackney.' Henry Handley Norris was born in the same year with himself (January, 1771), the son and grandson of two wealthy London merchants. He early formed the desire to take orders—a wish which was long resolutely combatted by his father, who designed him for his own calling; but the political convulsions and the attacks on religion which disturbed Europe at the time when he first began to think for himself, determined him to the duty of devoting his life to the cause of truth, at the sacrifice of private wealth, liberty, and ease. He always regarded his first introduction to Joshua Watson as providential. It arose from the accident of both, as young men of three-and-twenty, being appointed to collect money for a public dinner to the Shropshire militia, quartered at Hackney. 'From this accidental introduction a friendship grew up, which continued unbroken for near sixty years.' They soon took counsel together on the subjects which were already all important to them both. In a year's time, we read extracts from a few pages of a private journal kept by Norris, while on a visit with his new friend to Mr. Sikes, of Guilsborough, giving the heads of conversations on the highest themes; and along with these, indications of the line of thought which they were pursuing. He notes as a significant discovery that the three estates did not properly consist of King, Lords, Commons, but Lords Spiritual, Lords Temporal, and Commons; and enters a regret for the decay in patristic learning.

'Nov. 14. Rode with Watson to N——, to examine a collection of books for sale. It was lamentable to see works of many of the venerable Fathers of the Church, and numbers of our ancient worthies, lying mouldy and neglected, stained entirely through by the damp, and half consumed by worms. We rescued about sixty of the most valuable from the ruin which seemed to threaten them. The terms demanded and acquiesced in were two shillings a-piece.

"Nov. 17. Watson employed himself all the morning in polishing up the covers of the rescued books; I assisted T. Sikes in planting. But this evening, about five o'clock, we experienced a severe loss by the departure of Joshua Watson, who set off on his return to London. In him is centered every requisite to complete the character of a pleasant companion and sincere friend. For

the former capacity he possesses a strong mind, well stored with thoughts on every subject, which a most retentive memory enables him to draw forth at pleasure. Though diffident in delivering his opinion, he is by no means reserved, and is equally happy when giving information or receiving it himself. His judgment is correct, his attention always at command; and whilst in arguing he sticks close to his subject, and defends the point he contends for with acuteness, he is always open to conviction, and ever ready to acknowledge it. For the latter, unaffected good-nature, generosity, and every Christian virtue, stimulated and enlivened by a fervent piety and zeal for religion.—Vol. i. pp. 58, 59.

Van Mildert, subsequently Bishop of Durham, was another early friend. They became acquainted in 1796, soon after his preferment to the living of St. Mary-le-Bow; and we soon find, in spite of Joshua Watson's secular calling, and the six years by which he was his junior, that he had inspired his friend with a great respect for his opinion and judgment. Van Mildert had been appointed Boyle Lecturer, and was engaged in publishing his Lectures in 1806; on which occasion he showed his estimate of these qualities by sending his proofs to him, and anxiously pressing for his full and candid opinion on all difficult points. After apologising for the time and labour he is exacting, he concludes, on one occasion,—

'Believe me, it is neither compliment nor affectation when I say, that after the benefit I have already derived from your judicious and friendly criticisms, I cannot comfortably and satisfactorily go into the press, without having passed the ordeal of your inspection.'—Vol. i. p. 67.

And again,—

March 29. I have just met, in my way hither, a friend who has represented to me your multiplicity of troubles and difficulties. I have therefore resolved to give you to-morrow a complete day of rest, so far as the removal of my intended burden can affect it; I have therefore pocketed No. XIV. to carry home again; and, if upon a re-perusal I can satisfy myself with it, it shall go to the printer without giving you any further trouble. If not, I will endeavour to look in upon you some evening in next week, just to take your advice on a few particular passages. I am indeed very much grieved to have already made such unreasonable encroachments on your time, but I know not where to find a friend who can really be a substitute for you.'—Vol. i. pp. 69, 70.

This work ran through several editions, establishing Van Mildert's reputation as a divine, and leading to the Regius Professorship of Divinity, which he afterwards held. A curious incident is mentioned—curious, that is, in connexion with the greatness of his future fortunes—relating to a debt contracted from the fault of others in rebuilding his parsonage in Kent. When this became known to his friends, Joshua Watson, Sikes, and others, they resolved to discharge the debt anonymously; but having failed in their intended secrecy, the following extract from Van Mildert's letter expresses a natural mixture of feelings:—

'There is a pleasure, an exquisite one, in having such friends; but the wound given to the spirit of independence, by being obliged to make such a use of them, is not easily healed. It has been my misfortune to be more or less

embarrassed ever since I have been a beneficed man; and every additional benefice has brought its additional burdens, and made me poorer than before. So that, in spite of all the friendly helps I have met with, I still am, and to all human appearance ever shall be, a necessitous man. But it may be the will of Providence that these trials should be sent to correct that pride which perhaps you will think these sentiments discover. Be it so; and I may be enabled so to apply them! May you, my good friend, never know anything more of these troubles than by your ability and disposition to remove them!—Vol. i. p. 75.

That personal expense had not led to these difficulties, we may gather from an anecdote told in connexion with Lord Liverpool's conscientious distribution of patronage:—

‘He (Van Mildert) was then at his country living at Farningham, and his domestic economy, under the pressure already related, was so strictly maintained, that the Premier's private messenger could find only one servant—a female presiding at the churn. She was willing to seek her master, who had walked out into the garden, if the messenger would take her place, and keep the churn in motion.’—Vol. i. p. 138.

At this time, when he had to come to London, his lodgings were with Joshua Watson, in Mincing Lane; and the arrangement suited both so well, that, when he was made Bishop of Llandaff, the two friends became joint-tenants of a house in Great George Street, Westminster. After such marks of intimacy, it is significant to observe the profound respect maintained towards his friend in all letters and communications. No private friendship could remove in Joshua Watson's mind the distance between the Bishop of Durham and his former lay counsellor, or lessen the expressions of honour and respect due to him.

Another distinguished and lasting friendship, formed about the same time, through Van Mildert, was with Christopher Wordsworth, brother of the poet, and eventually Master of Trinity College, Cambridge; to whom the Editor pays a warm tribute of affectionate eulogy. ‘We met,’ Dr. Wordsworth used to say, ‘and became friends at once’—a testimony amongst many others to what must have been the remarkable attractions of Joshua Watson's manner. There is no indication of any of the deficiencies popularly attributed to a city training. He impressed men of the highest education and fullest minds with qualities and powers which placed him at once on the level of perfect intellectual and social equality. There was, too, we may assume, a native cheerfulness which prevented the weight of the interests on which his mind was intent from lapsing into heaviness. As a boy, at some place of public amusement, George the Third singled him out, saying to his attendants, ‘Look at that happy boy!’ and his old age, as described by those about him, was marked by much kindly playfulness. No one could act well with others in the innumerable affairs in which he was brought into contact with them, without

tact and other social gifts in some remarkable degree; and he no doubt possessed an intuitive discernment, an instinct of self-conduct, which would tell as favourably in private intercourse, as they did on more public occasions, when these qualities assisted him to carry so many important points, and to maintain harmony and union where party spirit imperilled both.

Those were times when politics were closely blended with religion; and we find added to this list of Churchmen, certain, secular names with which Joshua Watson was allied,—Gifford, editor of the ‘*Anti-Jacobin*,’ John Bowles, Reeves, and others opposed to the Horne Tooke school, and ‘the advocates of the new Gallican liberties.’ We find him in communication with William Cobbett, who, when he first came from America, was received as a martyr to his testimony against republicanism. After a time, however, when his real character showed itself, his self-sufficiency and unscrupulousness repelled his respectable allies; and on detecting in Joshua Watson an intention to shake him quietly off, he published ‘the only malicious abuse’ which was ever attached to his name. Joshua Watson’s apology for this early acquaintance may apply to many similar alliances: ‘We were then young, and his violence was rather a recommendation; he was so hearty in hating ‘what we hated.’ These Tory interests were, however, only digressions from the main objects of his life.

Through the influential friends we have enumerated, he had been introduced to Archbishop Manners-Sutton, as one whose genius might be made valuable to the Church.

‘Of the degree in which he afterwards enjoyed the confidence of that prelate he would often speak with unfeigned wonder. His part, he would say, was simply to lay information before him of things which, in his higher sphere, he could not see with his own eyes. The faithfulness and ability with which this was done advanced him, without expectation or seeking of his own, to an authority in counsel which his humble spirit could hardly realize to itself, though to others who witnessed such discerning diligence it appeared the most natural thing in the world.’—Vol. i. p. 94.

He and Norris had become members of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge before the close of the last century, and got the character of reformers for changes they set about and accomplished under the protest of certain old members who predicted ruin. However, the finances were soon trebled under their plan of District Committees, a machinery which afterwards proved of infinite value in the establishment of the National Society. This important scheme was first planned in 1811, at the house of Joshua Watson, and in concert with H. H. Norris and John Bowles. Its origin and organization are given at length by the Editor; indeed, his work is a complete dictionary of reference for all the labours and workers of the

orthodox party during a very energetic and successful period of united effort.

‘Joshua Watson was the Treasurer of the National Society from the date of its foundation; he watched over its prosperity and efficiency with unceasing and laborious care from the beginning; and his interest in it survived when, after thirty years of diligent service, he resigned the care of its funds to other hands. There were some of the first promoters of the new Society who would have had it made a department of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, and some who objected to the name which was finally chosen, as if it had been borrowed from late Gallican precedents: but its meaning was explained by the principle set forth in its first report, “that the national religion should be made the groundwork of national education,” and “that the first and chief thing to be taught to the children of the poor was the doctrine of the Gospel, according to the excellent Liturgy and Catechism provided by the Church of England.”’—Vol. i. pp. 103, 104.

The body of friends we have enumerated, all inspired by the same views and aims, meeting constantly to advance the same cause, and to encourage each other by interchange of thought, and now gradually collecting into one district, were fast forming into a party. Joshua Watson, in 1811, took a house at Clapton in his brother's parish of Hackney. H. H. Norris had two years previously undertaken the spiritual charge of the southern portion of Hackney parish. A chapel of ease was built for him not far from his own house in Grove Street. There he was perpetual curate, and laboured for forty years, acquiring himself a name, till Norris of Hackney became a household word with Church people. It was under his auspices—the three friends forming the nucleus, and able to exercise a very wide hospitality—that they, and such as assembled round them, came to be called the Hackney Phalanx. Joshua Watson was an invaluable man for a party to possess, he probably formed a main element of strength and stability in this; but he was not a party man, as it seems to us, by nature. He was not indisposed to compromise; he could work with people who differed from him, he was always able to see the merits of those opposed to his own views, and anxiously charitable in his judgments. Norris, from higher spirits, keener temperament, and an energetic sociability, had undoubtedly the make of a genial partizan; he inspired in those about him a warm sense of cheerful companionship along with respect for his theological acquirements and vigilant orthodoxy, remarkably exhibited in his vigorous Appeals against the Bible Society and the Jews' Society. Then we find Lloyd, afterwards Bishop of Oxford, writing to him under the soubriquet of the Patriarch:—

‘I used to say of Van, that he was so great in his knowledge of the exact doctrines of the Church of England, that orthodoxy oozed out of his pores, and he would talk it in his dreams. Now I hold your Holiness to be equally great in the knowledge of our ecclesiastical discipline,—nothing doubting of your doctrine,—and I suppose there is not a Church in the universe with which you are

not so intimately acquainted as to be able to state at a moment's notice every heretic abiding within the reach of it.'—Vol. i. p. 282.

There are testimonies to the happy impression left by intercourse with this whole zealous society. As when the Irish divine, Dr. Hales, speaks of the Hackney Phalanx, and the hospitable kindness with which they entertained him while carrying his book through the press, 'the recollection of which kindness made his heart warm to every Englishman he met,' and the Editor adds:—

'None who survive to remember the moral influence of the Hackney phalanx, an influence won by the union of men who were bound together by a disinterested love of the best things, will wonder at the warmth of this testimony. It was an influence which for many following years drew to these houses a varying but never failing band of the wise and good, and from which many a young student in the discipline of life and truth found his aims directed and his youthful vows confirmed.'—Vol. i. p. 98.

In a letter to the Rector of Hackney, Norris gives with pleasant deliberateness his views and motives for the formation of a party. It is at once characteristic of the man and of the Church party of that time which, we must note, was remarkable for, and also found its safeguard in, having no head, only a point for general gathering, and united operation:—

"MY DEAR VICAR,—Had I nothing to reply to your last, gratitude would extort a letter from me to thank you for your very entertaining and bountiful despatch. Indeed, I never think of Hackney without being proud of my relation to it, and rejoice exceedingly that I have been anyways instrumental in the celebration of its praises, though your report is the first intimation I have had of having rendered it this piece of service. Rasselas, you know, concludes his researches after happiness with the resolution of returning to his own country, and forming there a society of chosen men; and why should not I engage in the same undertaking? We read yesterday of Gebal, and Ammon, and Amalek casting their heads together with one consent; and why are we to suffer our English phlegm to keep us in a state of individuality? I want to see a centre formed, to which every zealously-affected Churchman may resort, and counterplot the numerous and most subtle devices against our very existence which every day is bringing to light. If we but knew our strength as our enemies do theirs, we should all be encouraged and strengthened. Dr. Hales has returned to Ireland thus benefitted; he thought himself like Elijah, but now knows that the cause of religion is not deserted; that, notwithstanding the prevailing apostasy, there are many who have not bowed the knee to Baal. I have done some good, therefore, by this modest assurance of mine; and so, friend John, I shall proceed, and wherever I can find a sound Churchman, I will lay violent hands upon him if I can. Yea, as David resolves, "Mine eyes shall look upon such as are faithful in the land, that they may dwell with me."—Vol. i. pp. 99, 100.

This absence of a head was the result not only of circumstances but of principles. It was never Joshua Watson's wish to undertake responsibilities where he could help it. In organizing societies he desired to leave all that could be left to the will of constituted authorities. This was shown in the system of missionary appointments by the Society for the Propagation of the

Gospel. He was earnest, as one of the main directors of the National Society, to leave the choice of books to the clergy, in opposition to the proposal that selections should be confined to the Christian Knowledge Society list. He argued that the parochial clergy might as safely be trusted with the teaching of their schools as with the charge of delivering Christian doctrines to their parishioners, and quietly carried his point. His spirit throughout was a different spirit, and grasping less at influence than we find in what we must call the opposite party; and in later years, during the troubles of 1843, he wrote of party leaderships—

‘Nothing has yet fallen out,’ he wrote, ‘contrary to my expectations, but I do not, therefore, feel confidence in my fears. Rather when I see how good and great men are blinded on one side, I remember how we all deceive ourselves, and am willing to believe myself an alarmist. . . . Indeed, I fear my own misgivings on the subject, and have not dared for a long time to realize my apprehensions as to the natural results of party leaderships, which will ordinarily be little different in a Newman or a Simeon.’—Vol. ii. p. 201.

He was alive, too, to the danger of unwise partizanship in causing reaction, and chilling many of its followers into a ‘fatal state of coldness and indifference.’ There was, as far as we can see, no leadership in this knot of practical workers. They were a united band, thinking alike, and acting together and acquiring considerable power; but everything was done under the cover of constitutional authority; so far, their influence was anonymous. It was shared with others, and if Joshua Watson, or Norris, or Hugh James Rose were the actual power it made all the difference, both in their own feelings and in the apprehension of their friends that it was under cover, and in constant reference to Bishops and dignitaries.

It must be owned that this party thus organized, and thus headless, had for the time a prosperous career. Zealous, active, with definite intelligible plans of practical good, they commended themselves especially to the respect of the then Premier, who showed himself most conscientious in the matter of Church patronage, and was inclined from circumstances to trust the Watsons. The elder brother had been his schoolfellow, and we read in a note—

‘In a list of the scholars at the Charterhouse about A.D. 1737, the name of John James Watson occupies the second place in the sixth form; the name of Robert Banks Jenkinson, afterwards second Earl of Liverpool, and for many years Prime Minister, stands eleventh. This upright and benevolent statesman was a little junior to Archdeacon Watson; and when he followed him to Oxford and to University College, being troubled in the college-hall with the assiduities of another former schoolfellow, who had acted the bully at school, but made court to him as a young man of rank at the University, he changed his seat to Watson’s side. “I shall be obliged to you,” he said, “if you will let me sit here; for I do not particularly want the slaver of the dog who can no longer bite.”’—Vol. i. p. 13.

Joshua Watson was not in a position to receive favours, and was scrupulous in asking them for others; but he writes on one occasion on the preferment of some good men in that strain of hope, and trust in the future which belongs to success:—

“You will have heard, in course, of our excellent and amiable friend Pott’s preferment to a stall at St. Paul’s; but perhaps you do not know that it is one of the very best things in Bishop Howley’s gift. It will, I hope, set that good man at ease in his profession. Lyall, too, a capital fellow *for a Trinity man*, succeeds to Blomfield’s chaplainship at London House; and T. L. Strong, to the great comfort of Bishop Van Mildert, gains a little living from the Chapter of St. Paul’s. And so the party here, which has been enriched by the addition of the Cambridges, is in high spirits, rejoicing that it is well with their friends, (Prov. xi. 10,) and looking forward with increased confidence to new causes of congratulation on the same grounds of general joy.”—Vol. i. p. 237.

Norris’s nature was not a personally ambitious one. He scrupled to receive a prebendal stall of little value from the Bishop of Llandaff, lest it should bring a doubt of his disinterestedness. ‘When I take preferment,’ he said, ‘I cease to be a volunteer in the service of the Church,’ which was the position he preferred. He liked the liberty of an unencumbered existence, and writes gratefully of the welcome he found amongst friends. ‘Frequently have I been constrained to acknowledge, ‘and I hope not without gratitude, that few men can have so ‘many delightful homes open to them, and such friends to greet ‘and cherish them.’ Indeed, we in our day cannot look upon the bright career of this happy warm-hearted hospitable band of fellow workers without a touch of regret for ourselves—a touch, let us add, of personal regret, in the case of those who, like our very selves, shared at whatever distance of age and station in the friendship, and kindness, and encouragement, and hospitality of that pleasant old house, and that genial old host, in Grove Street, Hackney. Perhaps in nothing was this geniality more conspicuous than in the attentions extended to young and active clergymen by Mr. Norris. It is a comfort to look back to those days, to which we can apply the appropriate lines of one not unfamiliar to the Hackney brotherhood:—

“We walked with open hearts and tongue,
Affectionate and true;
A pair of friends, though I was young,
And Matthew seventy-two.

This hearty, sociable co-operation was a feature of those times and belonged to all sides. They thought they had difficulties to contend with, but work is pleasant and trials not unbearable where there is a concentration of interest and a band of fervent hearty supporters to fall back upon.

Though we hear of a phalanx, which suggests ideas of war and contention, the Editor keeps clear of all direct mention of, and even makes very slight allusion to, the opposite party, in

consideration of whom this compact body of the church's defenders had organized itself. No party names, active as such were on their own side during these busy years, find a place here. We note this as a fact, but very far from a matter of reproach or regret. It is only too easy to recal, or even to imagine the clash of arms on many a platform, and in innumerable committee rooms and pulpits; and the fire and mettle and good-humoured defiance with which attacks would be met and rebutted and returned. There are other differences of which we have indications, if not the formal history; friendly contests and favourite measures and schemes failing, through misunderstanding, and the natural interposition of failure in human affairs. Such, for instance, we must consider 'Mant's Bible,' the result of the 'advocacy' of Joshua Watson, with his friends Christopher Wordsworth, Van Mildert, and Middleton, afterwards Bishop of Calcutta.

'But his plan was not altogether followed. What he had designed was a double commentary, one for the student, the other for cottage-readers. The first was to have been prepared by Van Mildert and Middleton, the other by Richard Mant, then Vicar of Coggeshall in Essex, one of Archbishop Sutton's chaplains. The rule proposed to be observed in the selection of notes was to confine all authoritative exposition of texts to divines of the Primitive Church, or of the Church of England since the Reformation: other writers were to be used more sparingly, and only when the Church had given them some sanction by adopting them in common use. The plan was, however, in some degree baffled by the Archbishop committing the task to his own two chaplains, Mr. Mant and Mr. George D'Oyley,—an arrangement with which Joshua Watson would not attempt to interfere, though he did not lose sight of his original purpose, and many years afterwards made another effort to set on foot a Cottage Bible.'—Vol. i. pp. 126, 127.

We are not surprised that the original promoters were not satisfied with the mode in which the task was executed. 'Mant's Bible' has been at least, in a negative sense, a misfortune; but a knowledge of the difficulties of such a task ought to make us lenient critics. Our space will only allow us to refer to the various good works in which Joshua Watson took an active and often an initiative part, in the busiest period of his life, when his powers were at their height, and his influence increased with the success of every undertaking. He was an indefatigable labourer for the *Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge*, and its treasurer from 1814 to 1833; and equally active for the *Society for the Propagation of the Gospel*, which he helped to remodel from an ecclesiastical board, mainly for administering Government funds and assisting in the support of the North American colonies, into a Missionary Society; and here it is mentioned, that Dr. Wordsworth endeavoured ineffectually to bring about a union with the *Church Missionary Society* at its outset. He was a chief instrument in the growth and furtherance of the colonial episcopacy. The three first colonial Bishops,

Middleton, Inglis, and Broughton, were his close confidential friends, and he was their main stay in procuring assistance from England, for the furtherance of their different undertakings. As the acknowledged authority, he drew up, at the request of the Archbishop, a memorial to be shown to Lord Liverpool, in relation to our East Indian possessions, which, as we read, remind us of the greatness of his services by the state of neglect and apathy from which he and his first friends raised the nation. He was appointed one of the Church Building Commissioners, and so relied upon by his friends as the security against insidious clauses, that they were uneasy if he was once absent from his post. We find him liberal of time and money for the Clergy Orphan School, and the Church Building Society. He was concerned in the founding of King's College, and on the first commencement of the Church Commission was the acknowledged representative of the Church's interests, and deputed by the Archbishop to draw up a scheme, which met the approval of the Duke of Wellington, though, as may be expected, it was not accepted by Lord Grey.

He had evidently a turn for societies; his own talents and temperament suited them, and made them answer; and he seems never to have wearied of this machinery so ready to his hands, though no man could be more jealous, and show greater mistrust, of the use made of societies and religious meetings in their popular development. In the formation of these his plan was to draw up a preliminary series of regulations and rules, which were submitted to his friends: and this first draft evidently went into all the minutiae and niceties of the question; for we find Archdeacon Daubeney, who acted with him in originating the Church Building Society, accepting all as judiciously and correctly drawn, up to the 15th resolution, at which he demurs for a moment. His manner in using his authority must have been one of his chief influences.

'It was of course inseparable from the post of influence which he had now attained, that Joshua Watson should be often called to guide and restrain, as well as sometimes to animate, the exertions of others. His zeal for the best of causes, and his brotherly charity, seem to have worked together in due proportions, and made him at once forbearing towards the weaknesses and indiscretions of good men, and skilful in bringing into action their nobler and better qualities. The letters of many correspondents bear witness to this trait in his character. To bring forward instances of such temperate restraint might be less convenient, as it might exhibit in an unfavourable light the infirmities of some whose names are worthy of honour. But it is impossible not to feel how blessed this influence was, when we see the immediate effect acknowledged by those who came into contact with it, and how he could change a tone of impatient and forward activity, which had been a source of annoyance to others and himself, into one of kindly deference, submitting to a more practical wisdom the decision of schemes which the promoter had at last found to be unmanageable.—Vol. i. p. 195.

Joshua Watson possessed a creative power on such matters, could embrace the whole question while yet in embryo; foresee facilities, and anticipate difficulties and objections, and be the vigilant guardian of the Church's interests under all possible contingencies. Many of the Bishops habitually made him the channel of communication upon the wants of their dioceses. His authority was so widely acknowledged, that people concerned did not like to act without him: thus there are many such testimonies from people in high station, as 'if I find myself by your side I shall know how to act.' 'Your arrangements are always right:' and on occasion of his absence, 'If you suppose we can do without you, you are the only man that thinks so.' And Bishop Blomfield writes, 'I am never easy when you differ from me.' All these honours were not flattery so much as encouragement. We see indications of a constant reticence and modesty, a continual guard over himself to keep his language and conduct down to the tone befitting a subordinate position. Archbishop Howley's testimony was,—

'For himself he could say, that from no man had he received such ready and judicious counsel, or such friendly assistance, free from the smallest taint of selfishness, and guided with the most unaffected and retiring humility.'—Vol. ii. p. 22.

This humility arose in part from a real sense of the dignity of the clerical and episcopal office, and of the privilege it was in any way to be the Church's servant; a sentiment which we may remark, by the bye, shows itself in the delicacy and considerateness with which he assisted the poorer clergy. This he often did anonymously, always with tender regard to their feelings, and sometimes with a large liberality which acknowledged a high sense of the social claims and needs of the clerical station. He made short speeches, and never allowed himself to fill the public eye more than was necessary. He had serious scruples, which it was not easy for his friends to overcome, to accepting the honorary degree conferred on him by the University of Oxford, and writes as if he *felt* the conspicuousness, 'the kind of public character which an accumulation of office gives to private labour,' an embarrassment and inconvenience. It was a position of which he felt the dangers, and against which, we learn from his more private biography, he used every means to defend himself. Praise always made him afraid; he avoided talking of self, and kept little record of his own immediate doings; there are constant cautions lest being concerned for religion, should be mistaken by the busy man for religion itself, and a care that no amount of public employment shall interfere with the duties of self-watchfulness, meditation, and private prayer.

Though not a writer himself, he was concerned with his friends in setting on foot those periodicals which at the time represented, or, as in the case of the *Christian Remembrancer*, still express the sentiments of the orthodox Church party. The Editor gives the history of the *British Critic*, from its rise in Jones' and Stevens' time, to its resuscitation under Norris and Joshua Watson, who desired to make it their organ. On this subject are some excellent remarks in letters from Lloyd to Norris, giving his views as to the duties and uses of such a periodical. The history is carried on to the period when it came into the hands of the Phaetons who overset it; causing, as our readers will suppose, many a regret in the staid elders, who witnessed the clever, daring, brilliant process of self-destruction. The *Christian Remembrancer*, which has taken its predecessor's place, as the Church Quarterly, under more prudent counsels, and, as we trust, in a humbler and wiser spirit of duty and obedience to the English Church, had its rise in the same quarter.

'H. H. Norris and Joshua Watson had laboured assiduously, some years before Hugh J. Rose succeeded in establishing the *British Magazine*, to set on foot a periodical which might assist the studies of the clergy, by furnishing literary notices of books, essays of a critical character, chapters of ecclesiastical history and biography, and selections from devotional writers. It was the complaint of Bishop Hobart, when he visited England in 1824, that he found the best educated among the English clergy well versed in other branches of learning or science, but ignorant of theology. There seemed some ground for such complaint, when for a long time it was found impracticable to support a journal of sacred literature. "The country clergy," said Mr. Norris, "are constant readers of the *Gentleman's Magazine*, deep in the antiquities of the signs of inns, speculations as to what becomes of swallows in winter, and whether hedge-hogs, or other urchins, are most justly accused of sucking milch-cows dry at night." No doubt there was often too much of that

" retired leisure,
That in trim gardens takes its pleasure."

A sense of this want induced him in the year 1818 to persuade a zealous and intelligent clergyman, the Rev. Frederick Iremonger, to start the *Christian Remembrancer*, which, after undergoing several changes of editors and plan, has continued to the present day.'—Vol. i. pp. 276, 277.

Our remarks have necessarily related to the doings and events of a great many years, without any close attention to chronology. The second volume of this biography bears upon a period which cannot yet be looked back upon without yearnings and without regrets, amounting to pain. We find Norris and Joshua Watson, in 1833, co-operating with the energetic spirits who had begun to make their influence so deeply felt, in the address to the Archbishop, which was at that time put forward to check the scheme for altering the Liturgy, then as now in agitation. Both welcomed them as brother workers; and Norris's nature was one to welcome zeal and intellectual power, such as was now offered to the Church's service, with enthusiasm. The original draft of the

address was submitted to these older and more experienced counsellors; and after undergoing some alterations at their hands, was put forward for signature, not without some previous misgivings on Joshua Watson's part, who wrote to Lyall, Archdeacon of Colchester—

'I had prayed Norris earnestly to lay before his correspondents the danger alike of success or of failure, for I know not which at this time would be worst for the Church. They were, however, too far committed to be open to such counsel as would have suspended all action; their "Suggestions" were already in circulation, though I had not seen them, and many promises of support had poured in upon them. And when such men as Keble, Newman, Palmer, and others were once up and stirring, it was little likely they would be put down by one who had never been applied to for an opinion, or that counsels of expediency would prevail with these high-minded men over the dictates of duty. Something, therefore, was to be done, and so done as to unite as much as might be those whom an association would be sure to disjoin. And for this, nothing seemed to me so promising as an Address to the Primate.'—Vol. ii. p. 31.

The address was signed by more than 7,000 clergy, and was followed by a Lay Declaration from the pen of Joshua Watson, which in a short time received the signatures of 230,000 heads of families. That such co-operation should continue long was not to be expected, though his feeling towards those whose subsequent defection he so deeply regretted was one of constant admiration and regard for their personal qualities and high disinterestedness.

Our space reminds us to turn from Joshua Watson's public labours to those more private and domestic details through which alone we can form a full estimate of a man's worth and character. Throughout his busiest career this domestic element was allowed full scope, and was indeed cultivated with all care. When, as a young man, he had heard his old friend Stevens declare himself only fit for the chimney corner, he had replied, 'that is the place one would most wish to be fit for,' and he was in fact always qualifying himself for this station. In old age he had confessed to his niece, from whose pen there is an exceedingly interesting and valuable record of his closing years, that it had been the aim of his life—

'to acquire a habit of meditation, but his life had been so busy, that he had always had to lament the intrusion of thoughts of action, what was doing, or what ought to be done.'—Vol. ii. p. 274.

In order to maintain time for quietness and meditation he steadily resisted all *work* on Sunday, though his was a sort of work which had something almost of the odour of sanctity in it.

'In the course of this year he had taken up his abode permanently in Westminster, having purchased the lease of a house in Park-street, No. 6, where he continued to reside for the following sixteen years. It was a residence in which hospitality was made to subserve the highest uses of Christian charity; and the remembrance of the spot is still cherished by those who can recall to

mind the assembling of the wise and good within those walls, and yet more, the playful tenderness and unreserved confidence which marked the domestic intercourse of their entertainer; the calm thoughtful hours and sacred rest of the Sundays, with which not even such counsels as his week-days were devoted to were allowed to interfere. One who was in those years a constant guest in Park-street, and was to him almost as a daughter, has recorded her impression of this point of character: "I hope I shall ever remember his exemplary manner of spending Sunday. One thing that strikes me is his determination to avoid all discussion of worldly business of *any* kind, while he allows and encourages mirth and even playfulness in the intervals of serious employment."—Vol. i. p. 238.

Endued as he was with a remarkable constancy, and capable of lasting impressions, he did not trust to natural temperament even in the matter of the affections, but set apart days of commemoration to keep fresh the recollection of those he had lost. His wife, whose death, after thirty-four years of happy union, was a blow felt so acutely as for a time to disable him from public labours, was ever after remembered in this way. In a course like his such precautions may indeed be needed, lest the public life should cloud and obscure the more sacred private life. 'I must,' he says to his niece in after years,

'I must, however, only say in general, that it is a sad persuasion of the impossibility of keeping such exquisite feelings in continual activity in our work-day world that makes me encourage a somewhat strict observance of certain periods in each of our lives, from its tendency to bring back those feelings in their first force and freshness, in order, as our guide tells us, that those impressions of pious resolution and religious purposes, of fear and love, of hope and desire which, by God's grace, present circumstances then wrought in us, may in some sort abide in us.'—Vol. ii. p. 171.

And again, to the same relative, he shows how habitual had been this jealousy of the ensnaring ties of public business, and how careful he was to maintain and keep fresh that inner current of thought and association without which, whatever the nature of his occupations, however closely connected with benevolence and religion, a man must deteriorate.

'In some of the quiet talks which were allowed me with my dear uncle during this winter, he would break through the reserve which was usual with him, and speak freely of those he had loved best on earth; he would sometimes blame his own reserve as selfish, saying that we had a right to be made better by his recollections of the departed. He again dwelt on the use of observing private anniversaries as a means of keeping up communion, and of the great blessing of the ordinance of day and night. Wrong as it would be to disturb others with the expression of our private sorrows, how forlorn would the mourner be did not night come to restore the fellowship, and suffer him to water his couch with his tears! And in times of business and prosperity, what should we do if night did not return to draw, like sickness, its merciful curtain between us and the vanities of life!'—Vol. ii. pp. 235, 236.

But such exercises are as much a sign of constancy as a means towards it, and this in fact was one of his chief powers. It was part of that strength of perseverance which goes so far towards making a great character. We are told, that in vocal music the art by which a singer becomes famous, lies as much in his powers

of sustaining the breath as in quality of tone. Some such vigour and freedom of sustained effort belongs to moral success. What is done in gusts and impulses, subject to breaks and interruptions, inspires little confidence and inevitably brings reaction. But a man who never flags, or relaxes, or changes, himself, is more than consistent in his own person, he is an element of strength to a cause and infuses the principle of constancy in others. This kept him cheerful and hopeful when old age came and active exertion relaxed, and the conduct of affairs was committed to other hands with which he could not always sympathise. He had acquired an habitual confidence in his cause, which satisfied him that all would turn out eventually for the best, though he sat by an observer instead of main stay. He knew that the truth could do without him. By degrees he resigned his honorary appointments and retired to a cheerful and honoured privacy: always consulted and deferred to by his old friends who rested on his judgment, while he himself mistrusted it and watched for the gathering obscurations and failure of power that come with advanced life. Nothing of public interest to the Church passed unnoted by him, and his opinions in letters and conversations are always characterised by his habitual sound sense and charitable judgment; and by a power of entering into the present position of affairs, which indicate how carefully he had always guarded himself from prejudice, or rather, how fully aware he was of the inevitable influence of old association and habit, so as to be able to make allowance for them.

We have spoken of the happy contagion of consistency and perseverance. It would not be easy to find a pleasanter illustration of this than is shown in the band of friends whose labours are recorded in this book—of friends who began their career together, and who worked together in unbroken harmony till death called them to their reward in a ripe old age. We call men fortunate who have the fit accompaniment of old age, ‘troops of friends;’ but such blessings are the result as much of care and of pains as of circumstances. Joshua Watson had always carefully cultivated his friendships, and on the death of Norris writes—

‘Our departed friend was the last link of, to me, an almost golden chain, by which I had been bound for more than half a century. For full that period we have taken sweet counsel together, and I do not know that I can call to mind a single point of difference even in opinion, much less in principle or practice. I bless God that I have been permitted, after the direction of a yet earlier friend, to “keep my friendships in repair,” and that in a degree for which I cannot be sufficiently thankful; but still there must be a void which cannot be filled up on this side of the grave.’—Vol. ii. pp. 289, 290.

While they lived, Dr. Wordsworth, Norris, and Joshua Watson were in the habit of meeting; and the niece who writes the

history of these latter years, speaks of the happy cheerfulness of the old friends, and, not less of the spiritual counsel they held together. Of the three, Wordsworth died first in 1846. Norris followed in 1850. Inglis, who kept up a close correspondence, had died in the same year. Van Mildert, who was of older standing, was lost to them in 1836; and Hugh James Rose, in 1839. Sikes of Guilsborough yet earlier. But it is to be marked of all, that only death separated them; and the friendship in each case held on unimpaired in freshness of feeling and constant intercourse to the last, one of the strongest testimonies that can be given to the sincerity and purity of their motives, and how little self interfered in their aims.

Archdeacon John James Watson, one of this same brotherhood, had died in 1839; and a still deeper wound had been inflicted on Joshua Watson than the loss of this beloved brother, in the unexpected death of his daughter, Mrs. Wagner, on occasion of the birth of her second son. It was then that his niece became a second daughter to him, and had thus the privilege of watching over his declining years and drawing a picture of a good man's last days. It is well to die at one's post as some men of great age have done; but where the life has been a busy one it is surely better, and shows a more perfect harmony and acquiescence with the orderings of Providence to withdraw the mind gradually and deliberately from the bustle of business and the stir of action, and to retire for the purposes of a more exact and particular preparation. Joshua Watson never felt himself *necessary* to the cause to which he devoted himself. He was not therefore tempted to the common temptation of a busy temper in old age, to hold office to the last, under the real though perhaps unacknowledged persuasion that an efficient substitute is impossible.

It is to be noticed, that though habitually guarded in his expressions, and from principle little prone to the effusions of talkative religious feeling, his conversations with his niece and other friends at the close of his life are marked by a singular ease and even fervour of language. All the deep truths, all the consolations of religion, were not only in his heart but on his lips. The poetry of his nature, which might not seem to have found appropriate nourishment in his active life, now found free play. He loved to quote from the stores of a tenacious memory the poet Wordsworth, and the 'Christian Year'; and Barrow and Jeremy Taylor were text-books with him. He entered, too, into the lighter reading of the day, and had leisure of mind and freshness of interest to throw himself into fiction, especially where this implied sympathy with the young people about him, and amongst whom he loved to find himself. His niece writes—

'We were reading "Heartsease," and he often seemed the youngest of the party in the keenness of his interest in the characters, and his never-failing recollection of every circumstance of the story.'—Vol. ii. p. 309.

Within a few months of his death he was visited by the Bishop of New Zealand, then in England, and in whose labours he had always taken deep interest.

'A few months later Bishop Selwyn wrote thus of the intercourse which had been permitted him with his aged friend, intercourse of which he said publicly, that if he had gained nothing else by his visit to England, it would have been an ample recompense for the journey:—

"It is no small happiness to me to have been just in time to see him, and to have enjoyed two long and precious interviews, when the setting sun, though just touching the horizon, was still unclouded, and differing only from its former self in the mellowness of its evening light."—Vol. ii. pp. 307, 308.

And the biographer records another testimony to the beauty of this season of her uncle's life, which we quote as coming from one who had not known him in the busy part of it.

'I shall ever look upon it as one of the privileges for which I am deeply thankful, the opportunity of seeing and conversing with Mr. Joshua Watson within the last year at Daventry. I remember so well, as a lad, case-hardening myself against the name of Joshua Watson, which I was continually hearing quoted as a final authority in all Church-matters, and I pictured to myself a hard, dry, impenetrable man, who had no sympathies beyond a committee-room in Pall Mall or at Fulham. I certainly long ago learnt to change this opinion of youthful conceit, but it was a real delight to me to do my inward penance at his own table, and have my former self condemned, and yet, as I felt at the same time absolved, by his unaffected wisdom and piety, his pleasant and even playful conversation, and the zeal with which he entered into the newest and most advanced Church schemes, without a shade of the dogmatizing of old age, or the assumption of an authority which would have been so readily admitted. He seemed still the helper and sympathiser, indeed rather the listener and learner, encouraging instead of damping new projects. A less set and prejudiced man for one of strong fixed principles I never saw, and it was delightful to see the vigorous life of faith and love as fresh as ever within its wasted tabernacle. Excuse me for running on with what must be commonplace home-truths to you, but it revives in me for a while a blessed memory in which I cannot deny myself the pleasure of indulging.'—Vol. ii. pp. 308, 309.

His death took place in January, 1855, in his eighty-fifth year; his last hours cheered by every outward circumstance of tender respect and private affection, and far more by the consolations of an ardent faith and assured hope.

Many traits are given of characteristic liberality and benevolence. His devotion to public institutions had never interfered with his private charities, which seem to have been on a most generous, almost lavish scale. He helped the poor, he assisted indigent friends and relations—allowing many of them regular pensions. Everything constituted a claim. He gave a painted window where his father had gone to school; and remitted a considerable sum to a man because he had once been

his rival in business. He never gave people up or was discouraged by failure—not from want of discernment in himself, but that he held the long-suffering of Providence an example he was bound to follow. His niece, too, has preserved some of his sayings, gathered from confidential conversations, and given as the conclusions of his observations. Not that he aimed at the sententious or oracular, he indeed lived under the fear of egotism and display; but so consistent a career must have been the result of system as well as temperament; and system naturally expresses itself in conclusions. These gleanings from his matured experience prove, as his whole course proves, the mutual relation of thought and action which had always existed in him and prompted his efforts and undertakings. His thought had always tended to immediate practice. His practice never anticipated or ran counter to his deliberate opinion; and with him a well-weighed opinion had the force of a principle, and was acted upon in duty and in faith. It is certain that he impressed all who had to work with him in public affairs, and all who had to do with him in domestic relations, with the sentiment that consistent goodness and virtue must inspire. He was in their eyes, without the large list of reservations and apologies which usually accompany such a testimony, emphatically a good man: Nature and constitution no doubt befriending the fair picture—as exempting him from the temptations that beset brilliant talents and a more sensitive organization. But every temperament has its own temptations, and it was in overcoming these, in a strict obedience to the dictates of conscience, in habitual self-control, and in a diligent cultivation of his powers, in order to devote them to the highest ends, that his character attained its excellence.

ART. III.—*The History of the Jews from the Christian Era to the Dawn of the Reformation.* By PHILIP HENRY GOSSE. London: Printed for the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. 1855.

AT a time when inspiration is called in question, and prophecy denied, it is of no small importance to be able to appeal to living facts to prove the truth of both; and nowhere can we so confidently appeal as to the history of Israel in all its stages, since the uttering of the great prophecy of our Lord (Matt. xxiv.)—which is, in truth, only the last of a long series that had been uttered previously—to the present time. Nay, we may go back to the moment when the great Lawgiver himself, before his people entered on their career of conquest of the Promised Land, foretold to a victorious people, with marvellous exactness, the desolations unparalleled, and almost inconceivable, that have since come upon them (Deut. xxviii.)—a people separate from others in their prosperity, and separate also in their adversity—a perpetual wonder for their preservation in their own land, and equally a wonder for their preservation in those of the stranger. No other people ever has, or ever could have, preserved their existence through the persecutions of seventeen centuries, but one which the Ruler of the world intended to preserve in order to fulfil His own purposes. Whether we look to the East or to the West, to Babylon, Palestine, or Spain, the event proves the truth of prophecy. Tenacity of life is only equalled by tenacity of their religious rites. While other religions have passed away before the conquering Cross, Judaism flourishes still. While other nations, once great, and, in their field of operations, for a time invincible, have vanished, or been absorbed into other peoples, so as to form, out of the amalgamation, one new race, with almost a new language, these have continued unchanged and unchangeable; little trace remains of the Roman of two thousand years ago in the Gothicised Italian of to-day; the irruptions of the northern tribes into the Lower Empire have dissipated the blood of the ancient Greek; Arab conquest has effaced the African Vandal from the country of his adoption; the Mongol hordes in Asia have supplanted the mighty empires of Persia, Assyria, and Babylon. Amid all these changes, the Jew of conquered Palestine remains the same. While the learning and civilization, long inherited and never lost, far surpassing the rude barbarism of the northern conquerors, eminently fitted him for posts of trust and honour in the

governments of the latter, yet the curses written in the law were ever coming upon him to the uttermost, and the blood that he imprecated upon himself at the crucifixion was continually required at his hands by the believers in the Crucified. One day we see the Jew administering, with sagacity and prudence, the finances of a Christian kingdom; on the next we see the decree of an ecclesiastical council demanding his blood or banishment, as an enemy of Christ. One day we see him exercising the noble art of medicine with a knowledge and skill which he had inherited from Eastern sages; on the next we hear a popular cry for his life, on the senseless plea that he had poisoned the wells of the country. The moment that crowned his long-suffering and efforts with success was that which endangered his very life and liberties. We purpose, in the present article, to follow out the history of this remarkable people in one of the most remarkable of its periods, viz. that in which, after the fourth great catastrophe of their race, under the Emperor Hadrian in 135, they again appear in power and importance under their spiritual head, the Patriarchs of the West, and their temporal kings, the Princes of the Captivity, in the East.¹

We cannot help noticing the extraordinary fact, that the most interesting history of this singular people, from the time of the destruction of Jerusalem by Hadrian to that of their final banishment from Spain in the fifteenth century—which may be reckoned as the extinction of their glory,—is so little known, and so slightly attended to, in most compendiums of history. How few among us have read the pages of the diffuse, and not altogether trustworthy, Basnage, or the more accurate Jöst, to say nothing of the laborious Buxtorf. Even Dean Milman, Dr. M'Caul, and Mr. D'Israeli, have failed to excite an interest in what may be called mediæval Judaism, among a people, and at a time, that the greatest interest is manifested in the modern children of Abraham; and yet few histories contain such interesting episodes, and such strange vicissitudes of fortune. As a people, literature and learning had a home among them, and kept their place, when the swarms of northern barbarians, both of Europe and Asia, had overwhelmed both on either continent, or enclosed them within the cells of the convent and the walls of the declining capital of Eastern Rome. No less curious is it to note, that when the Mohammedan conquest of the latter

¹ Let us say here, once for all, that when we speak in this article of the East and West, we are following the Jewish division, and not that which is generally understood in history,—the division of the Roman empire. The East, in Jewish history, is the country east of the Euphrates; the West, all west of that river, including, of course, Palestine and Egypt, as well as Europe and Africa.

caused the revival of letters in the West, by the dispersion of the learned of Constantinople among the courts and universities of Europe—stimulated by the invention of printing—Jewish science declined, excepting in rare and individual instances. It had done its work; it was no more needed: its brightness paled before the rising of the brighter luminaries of the Christian Church.

We propose, then, to take our readers back to the time of the fourth destruction of Jewish Jerusalem, and trace the history of Judaism in Palestine and Babylon to the extinction of independence in both. Hadrian assumed the purple in 117, and soon turned his eyes toward the turbulent and restless inhabitants of Judea: determining to put a stop for ever to the rebellious plans of the ever-plotting Jews, he sent forth an edict that Jerusalem should be razed, and a Roman colony established in its stead, with a temple dedicated to Jupiter on the very spot where that of Jehovah had once stood. Already had the Jews been forbidden to be circumcised, so that the extinction of their race, as a separate people, seemed imminent, or, at least, its absorption into that of the heathen Gentiles that surrounded them. All seemed lost but hope; their history, full of the miraculous deliverances of the Lord, led them to expect that, in their darkest hour, He would interfere to save them: besides, the persuasion hopelessly clung to that the time was at hand when the highest glory of all the kingdoms of the earth was to be theirs,¹ would be only more fondly cherished in their hour of peril.

And it was at that moment that one appeared who proclaimed himself as the Deliverer: he announced himself as the 'Star of Jacob,' and declared that his name was Bar-Cochab, 'the Son of a Star'; he called in aid miraculous powers to attest the truth of his pretensions, fire visibly proceeded from his mouth; his miracles, or his assertions, deluded the Rabbi Akibah, the greatest living authority in the Jewish Law; and he allowed himself, at the age of one hundred and twenty, to be called the Standard-bearer of the Son of the Star. We are not going to give a description of the horrors of that war; Jerusalem fell,² and only the stronghold of Bithers³ remained: at length it also was taken, and was given over to the carnage of

¹ 'Percrebuerat oriente toto vetus et constans opinio, esse in fatis, ut eo tempore Judæa profecti rerum potirentur.'—*Sueton. Vespas.* cap. 4—8.

² 'Pluribus persuasio inerat, antiquis sacerdotum literis contineri, eo ipso tempore fore, ut valesceret oriens, profectique Judæa rerum potirentur.'—*Tacit. Hist.* lib. v. cap. 9—13.

³ On the same day, 9th Ab, that Nebuchadnezzar took Jerusalem, and that Titus destroyed it.

⁴ Until the last few years, the site of Bithers was unknown; its discovery is due to the Rev. G. Williams, who found a village called Beiter, and near it a rocky eminence well suited for defence. See *Holy City*, Pt. I. ch. iii. pp. 136, 137.

an infuriated soldiery. Fearful stories are told of that massacre: the Rabbin say that more fell there than came out of Egypt with Moses; this is probably an exaggeration. We do know, however, that in that war there perished, according to Roman authority, 580,000 by the sword alone, besides those that died from famine, while an untold number was sold as slaves both in Asia and in Egypt. Jackals and hyenas howled about the empty streets and deserted houses of once populous towns; and desolation alone seemed to hold undisputed sway; to all human calculation the Jewish nation had perished. It was not thus to happen: the remnant of Israel was to be, according to prophecy, 'a sign and a proverb among all nations whither the Lord had scattered them.' Within the short space of sixty years after this event something almost like a resurrection from the dead appeared in the scattered nation, and two regular and powerful governments rose on the ruins of the former. On the quiet shores of the Lake of Genesareth, in the town of Tiberias, appeared a sort of spiritual despotism—Rosh Abboth, Chief of the Fathers, called, in Greek writers, the Patriarch, to whom the West paid a willing obedience; while, in the East, there arose another, outside the Roman empire, at Babylon, of even greater importance, who is styled 'The Prince of the Captivity.'

Out of the massacre of Bithur only one scholar escaped, Simon, the son of Gamaliel; like the Rabbin and teachers he had to hide himself till the bitter persecution was over; and it was not till the reign of the philosopher, Antoninus Pius, that the schools could be reopened; then Simon was acknowledged president, for he had a sort of hereditary claim to that dignity. At last, after several migrations, Tiberias was chosen as the seat of authority, and there was set up that Jewish Pontificate which, for centuries, was cheerfully acknowledged throughout the whole West; the tribute for the support of his dignity was collected more easily from the Euphrates to the Atlantic than even the taxes for the imperial treasury of Rome. 'Even now,' writes Origen, 'when the Jews are under the dominion of Rome, and pay the didrachm, how great, by the permission of Cæsar, is the power of their ethnarch. I myself have been a witness that it is little less than that of a king. For they secretly pass judgments according to their laws, and some are capitally condemned, not with open and acknowledged authority, but with the connivance of the Emperor. This I have learned, and am fully acquainted with, by long residence in their country.'¹

In every synagogue—and there was a synagogue in every

¹ Quoted by Millman, vol. iii. p. 134.

place where ten men, not altogether employed in secular pursuits (*decem otiosi*), could be found to form a congregation—collection was made for the Patriarch; each year the Patriarch sent his collectors—they are called Apostles, the office was an old one, and employed to designate those who collected tribute for the Temple,—who visited every synagogue, received the tribute, and reported the state of affairs to the Patriarch on their return. Each synagogue, like the mosques in Mohammedan countries at the present day, had its court of judicature as well as its divinity school; a plan convenient, if not necessary, when, as in the Pentateuch and the Khoran, the civil law is identical with the ecclesiastical. Appeals necessarily came to the Patriarch, whose decision was final: hence his great power. In these decisions he was assisted by the Sanhedrim, whose powers were devoutly believed by the Jews to be derived from Moses and the seventy elders that composed the judicial court in the wilderness, and to have been continued by perpetual succession till their own time. We need not stop to refute this, nor even to trace the origin of this body; it is sufficient to say that it came into power after the divine order of prophets had ceased, and the divine oracles of Urim and Thummim had for ever become silent. As long as power remained in Jerusalem, and the sacred ritual was celebrated in the Temple, and the dispersed of Israel came from every part to keep the great feasts, the Sanhedrim found little difficulty in administering the law; but when all this had passed away, and Israel became not a denizen merely in foreign lands, but held there a permanent habitation, when each foreign synagogue became a centre of civil and ecclesiastical law, totally differing from that of the country in which it was, then it became necessary to have some written guide to show the interpretation of the Law, and to record the decisions of the judges: a mass of unwritten precedents might remain as a tradition among the members of the Sanhedrim, but could hardly extend to foreign synagogues. Such a guide was needed, and R. Jehudah Hakkodosh (the Holy), the successor to R. Simon in the Patriarchate, supplied it. He gathered all the traditionary decisions, and arranged the most important of them in a volume called the *Mishna*, or *Repetition*.

This volume was studied by thousands as the only explanation of the Law; learning in the law alone now gave eminence in the Israelitish republic; honours and wealth awaited the successful student. 'The truth is, that Judaism had found its last asylum ' in its numerous academies or colleges, which boasted of a race ' of Mishnaical doctors, residing at different places. A strange ' and wondrous spectacle was now exhibited to the universe. A ' conquered nation had changed their military leaders into

' Rabbins, and their hosts into armies of students. We have
' accounts of pale-cheeked squadrons, covered only with the dust
' of the schools: but where ten or twenty thousand disciples were
' practising their tactics under some able chieftain of the
' traditions.'¹

This treatise, the Mishna, is, in truth, a very crude collection of precedents, some contradictory to each other, many leaving the point in debate doubtful. That inclination, so strongly condemned by our Lord, of paying strict attention to outward observance, and neglecting the weightier matters of the Law, increased in the disputations of the schools. The letter of the Law became the great study, outward observances the chief point in religion; distinctions of clean and unclean, of things that polluted and those that did not, engrossed the attention of the schools, and demanded the gravest judgments of the most learned Rabbin. To clear up these points was the collection of the Mishna made: it treats of all subjects from the ritual of worship down to trivial domestic arrangements. The following is a specimen:—

' § 3. Leather straps of the Tephilin with the Tephilin [attached thereto] make the hands unclean. R. Siwon saith, "The straps of the Tephilin do not make the hands unclean."

' § 4. The margin in a book of the law, at the top and at the bottom, at the beginning and at the end [thereof] make the hands unclean. R. Jose saith, "[The margin] at the end does not make the hands unclean until the roller be attached to it."

' § 5. A book [of the Law] in which [the writing] is obliterated, but which still contains eighty-five letters, a number equal to the Parasha, makes the hands unclean. Any Megillah which contains eighty-five letters, [a number] equal to the above-named Parasha, makes the hands unclean. All Sacred Scriptures make the hands unclean. R. Jehudah saith, "Canticles make the hands unclean, but Ecclesiastes is [subject to] dispute [difference of opinion]." R. Jose saith, "Ecclesiastes does not make the hands unclean, but the Canticles are [subject to] dispute." R. Simon saith, "Ecclesiastes is one of [those observances in which] Beth Shammai [are] less strict, and Beth Hillel more rigid." R. Simeon ben Azai said, "I have it as a tradition from the mouths of seventy-two elders, on the day they inducted R. Eleazar ben Azariah into the president's seat, that Canticles and Ecclesiastes [both] make the hands unclean." R. Akivah said, "Mercy forbid! no man in Israel ever disputed that the Canticles make the hands unclean, as the whole [history of the] world does not [offer an epoch] equal to the day, on which the [book] Canticles was given to Israel; for all the Kethoobim [Hagiographers] are holy, but the Canticles are holy of holies." The dispute [in question, therefore,] referred to Ecclesiastes [only]. R. Jochanan ben Joshua, the son of R. Akivah's father-in-law, said, "Even as ben Azai stated, so was the dispute, and so was [also] the decision."²

¹ Genius of Judaism, p. 85.

² Mishna. Treatise Yadaim, ch. iii. This extract is from the Mishna, translated into English—at least, a part of it—by Mr. de Sola, and Mr. Raphell. London, Sherwood and Gilbert, 1843. The portions in brackets are supplied by the translators.

We need scarcely stop a moment to point out how little is really decided on the question in dispute, and how puzzled would be any one who wished to have the point finally settled. Of course, the followers of the School Shammai would take one side, those of Hillel the other—Scotists and Thomists, Franciscans and Dominicans, as it were, by anticipation—only of far more importance than the difference of the latter, since the question of cleanness and uncleanness entered into the very essence of their religion. Naturally, the Mishna needed a comment, as well as the Law; 'at first considered as the perfection of human skill and industry, it was at length discovered to be a vast indigested heap of contradictory decisions. It was a supplement to the Law of Moses, which itself required a supplement. Composed in curt unconnected sentences, such as would occur in conversation, designed to be got by rote by the students from the lips of their oracles, the whole was at length declared not to be even intelligible, and served only to perplex and terrify the scrupulous Hebrew. Such is the nature of "traditions" when they are fairly brought together, and submitted to the eye.

'The Mishna now only served as a text (the Law of Moses being slightly regarded) to call forth interminable expositions. The very sons of the founder of the Mishna set the example, by pretending that they understood what their father meant. The work once begun, it was found difficult to get rid of the workmen. The sons of "The Holy" were succeeded by a long line of other rulers of their divinity schools, under the title, aptly descriptive, of the *Amoraim*, or *dictators*. These were the founders of the new despotism; afterwards, wanderers in the labyrinth they had themselves constructed, roved the *Seburaim*, or *opinionists*, no longer dictating, but inferring opinions by keen disputations. As in the decline of empire, mere florid titles delight, rose the *Geonim*, or *sublime doctors*; till at length, in the dissolution of this dynasty of theologians, they sunk into the familiar titular honour of *Rabbi*, or *master*.¹

These commentaries on the Mishna were called the Gemara, or *perfection*; the two together form the Talmud, or *doctrine*. They were commenced by R. Jehudah's disciples, and completed, it is generally supposed, somewhere about the end of the third century: this is known as the Jerusalem Talmud. In it the Mishna, and not the Levitical Law, is the text, of which the Gemara is the interpretation.

This Talmud, however, was far from giving satisfaction: it

¹ D'Israeli, p. 88.

was complained that the style was unpolished, the dialect barbarous, and the authorities quoted were few, many eminent Rabbin being omitted. Perhaps, amid all this, there was some little jealousy in the flourishing schools of Babylon of the now declining power of the Patriarch; it was only right that their Rabbin and their decisions should hold equal place with those of the West. Accordingly, R. Asa, of Sora, undertook the task of the compilation of an enlarged Talmud. Forty years were spent by him in this great work; their close saw the end of his life, but not of his undertaking; his disciples took it up, and the work went on: it is supposed to have been completed about the commencement of the sixth century.¹

The minute attention to the letter, which now more than ever characterized the Rabbinical teaching, almost necessitated the labours of a class of men who should give their whole attention to the preservation of the Scriptures in their literal integrity; a false transcription of a word, nay, even of a letter, might impair the sense, or even destroy the meaning of the inspired writing. To preserve the integrity of the letter became the supreme care of the masters of the schools; they enumerated, registered, and classed the letters of the whole Bible so as to make, from that time forth, mistake almost impossible, or, if made, easy of correction. Thus we are told that in Genesis there are 12 great divisions, 43 chapters, 1,534 verses, 20,713 words, and 781,000 letters. Before the art of printing nothing can be conceived as more valuable for the preservation of the text. The men who did this were called Masorites.

Besides this work there was another which, from the circumstances of the time, was equally necessary, and that was the insertions of the vowel points. As long as the Hebrew was a living language, uncorrupted by the introduction of foreign words, idioms, and phrases, there was little need of this aid; the context would fix the meaning of a doubtful word: but when the exact language of the Bible ceased to be the vernacular, when many new words were in use in the place of old ones become obsolete, every guide was needed: the Masorites, by introducing the vowel points, fixed the meaning of the word, at least, as it was understood in their time. When this was done is still a question among the learned. Basnage quotes a passage

¹ The Jerusalem Talmud has been twice printed—at Venice, in 1523, 1 vol. folio; and at Cracow, 1 vol. fol.

The Babylonian Talmud has been several times printed. Venice, 1520, 12 vols. fol.; Basle, 1581; Amsterdam, 1644; Berlin and Franckfort, 1715, 12 vols. fol. This last is said to be the best edition.

from Jerome, which shows that the points did not exist in his time.¹

The sixth order² of Jewish doctors is the Cabbalists, an order which has exercised a far larger influence than any of the others—an influence which may be said to have created numerous sects of heretics in the early ages of the Church, and to have corrupted many of the orthodox to an inconceivable extent. According to them, Cabbalism has existed from the creation—nay, even before it. In it was contained the mystery of the creation, the fall both of men and angels, and the redemption by the Messiah. God instructed angels into its secrets, and they, in turn, conveyed their knowledge to favoured men: thus, Raziel taught Adam, Jophiel instructed Shem, Raphael Isaac, Metatron Moses, and Michael King David. It culminated in Solomon, who, by it, understood the language of birds, and beasts, as well as those of all nations; nay, his power extended to the realm of spirits, for he commanded the services of demons and fallen angels. Its secrets were traditionary, they had never been committed to writing; inherited by word of mouth, they were augmented by intense study. The first that broke through this rule was R. Simeon Jochaides, the reputed author of the book of Zohar. R. Simeon is said to have lived about the time of the destruction of the Temple by Titus: taking refuge in a cave from persecution, he commenced his work; here he was instructed by frequent visits of the Prophet Elijah, besides a special revelation conveyed to him by means of the words themselves, which fell of their own accord into such an order as to make plain the mysteries they contained. Whether R. Simeon was the author of Zohar, and whether he lived at the time mentioned, is not, perhaps, certain; but that Cabbalism had attained immense influence in the first century, there can be no doubt. The whole system of Gnosticism is

¹ 'En effet, Saint Jérôme (Hieron. in Jerem. xxii.) se trouvant embarrassé sur le mot de *debar*, qui peut avoir différentes Significations, selon la différente Ponctuation, il [sic] remarque que l'embarras naît de ce que les Juifs n'ont point de Voies, et que chacun explique, selon sa Prudence, la Liaison que ce Terme peut avoir avec ce qui précède, et ce qui suit.'—*Basnage, Histoire des Juifs*, liv. iii. chap. ix. § 12. The end of the chapter leaves the date of this introduction of the points in about the same uncertainty as the commencement. It is remarkable that the date of the introduction of accents into Greek is likewise uncertain; it seems to have taken place about the same time as that of Hebrew points, and probably for the like cause, viz. the declension of the language. It is worthy of note, that the Greek accents on proper names in the LXX. generally correspond to those in the Hebrew.

² The six orders are—1. The Tanaites, Doctors; i.e. those who maintained unwritten traditions from Ezra to Jehdah the Holy. 2. The Talmudists. 3. Sebu-reans, or Pyrrhonians, from Sevara, *opinion* Dubitants, because they disputed without coming to a decision. 4. The Gaonim, *sublime* or *excellent*, generally heads of schools. 5. Masorites, from Masora, *tradition*. 6. Cabbalists.

essentially Cabbalistic, and Gnosticism is as certainly Jewish in its origin; the engrafting on this system the revelations of the New Testament was only a development in a particular direction. But, after all, Cabbalism is equally of heathen origin: it is found in all the ancient mysteries, Egyptian, Phœnician, or Grecian; and as such we must regard it. The strange cosmogonies, the generations of *Æons*, are not to be taken literally: they are merely figures or veils which cover and contain the real doctrine. No doubt the vulgar, the uninitiated, believed all these to be realities; but the initiated penetrated the meaning beneath. This is the very essence of Cabbalism; the letter for the unlearned; but that which lies under the letter, the mystery, for the initiated. Thus, there are three kinds of worlds, represented under the form of three men; all the limbs and parts of these bodies represent the operations of the Divinity: to each of these men is assigned a wife, representing the production of all things:¹ the head, instead of brains containing dew, white and pure as crystal; in the right hand a cross—these two things we shall have to mention afterwards,—as well as the universal appearance of the two principles, the male and female, so clearly agreeing with the great feature of the mysteries of Isis. How all this was developed in the reveries of Valentinus and Basilides, readers of *S. Irenæus* well know: all are not, however, equally aware that it is from these that the once celebrated Rosicrucians² drew their lore; nor has the fact been yet traced with the accuracy it deserves, that the 'Great Asian Mystery' of the present day is only a remnant of the Jewish Cabbala, or, more probably, of the Gnostic development, engrafted upon the Khoran, as the Gnostics engrafted it on the Gospels. The secret religions of the Druses, the Assassins, the Ansireeh, are the lineal descendants of the Gnostic heresies; they pretend that under the letter of the Khoran there lies a mystical interpretation,³ to which the initiated are led by degrees and steps; the full knowledge of which is pure atheism.

¹ Burckhardt (*Travels in Syria*, p. 152) asserts that the object of Ismayly worship is the female symbol, and the Ismaylys are reported to mix, on certain days in the year, in promiscuous debauchery' Mr. Walpole, in his book (*Ansairii Assassins*), gives, at the end of vol. iii. a Latin translation of what he calls a prayer of the Ansireeh, but which really is an Ismaelee prayer, which proves beyond doubt Burckhardt's assertion. Dr. Smith (as quoted in Carl Ritter's *Erdkunde*) says, 'The Ansireeh are not guilty as the Ismaelees of the worship of the goddess of nature.' They seem to use what they worship as a symbol of mother earth.'—*Note in Lyde's 'Asian Mystery,'* p. 97.

² Rosicrucian is derived from *Ros*, dew, and *Cruz*, a cross.

³ Among these secret Mohammedan sects, the esoteric meaning of the Khoran is termed *El-Batin*, the exoteric *Ez-Zahir*; the allegorization is called *Taweel*, in contradistinction to *Tanzeel* (descent), the literal.

We must now return to the Patriarchate of the West, though it will be only to record its gradual extinction. Its real history is wholly taken up with disputes and discussions in the schools, learned decisions on unimportant matters, of no interest to the general reader. Historians the Jews had none; what we do know comes from other sources, and some of those very imperfect. At the beginning of the fifth century, we find that power fast declining, internal dissensions at the court, and difficulties in raising the tribute in foreign synagogues and among communities which were every day assuming a more independent position in the several countries where they were settled, were rapidly causing the decay of the power of the ecclesiastical head of Western Judaism. We read, too, of strange stories—in Christian authors, for Jewish ones are wholly silent on this point—of Patriarchs suspected of having embraced Christianity. Epiphanius tells us that R. Hillel III. was baptized by a bishop on his death-bed. The Patriarch, we are told, sent for the Bishop of Tiberias under pretence of consulting him as an experienced physician: water was brought by his own servants on the same plea; and when the latter had retired, he received at the hands of the bishop clinic baptism. Joseph, his own physician, found in the house a Hebrew translation of the Gospels of S. Matthew and S. John, and the Acts of the Apostles. He read them, and was converted. Being detected in reading the Gospel of S. John, he was discharged from his office of collector of the revenue, and scourged in the synagogue; afterwards some fanatics of his own nation tried to drown him in the river, but he escaped their hands: we next find him a baptized Christian, high in the favour of the emperor, and count of the empire. The accession of Constantine to the throne and the spread of the new religion—an apostasy from Judaism as the Jews accounted Christianity—which was immensely impelled by the conversion of the Head of the Empire, both contributed to hasten the decay of the power of the Patriarch of the West, and the influence of the Sanhedrim of Tiberias. Laws were passed for the protection of converts from Judaism, and prohibitions against converts to Judaism: the Jewish tribunals were now forbidden to stone or put to death Jewish converts to Christianity; Jews were forbidden to possess Christian slaves—it is clear from these laws that Jews, in common with other nations, enjoyed the privilege of Roman citizenship. Tribute was becoming every year more difficult to collect; an imperial decree at length prohibited it altogether. From that hour the doom of the Patriarchate was certain, and it finally disappeared in the year 429; Gamaliel III. is the last that bore this title, which had existed through three and a half centuries.

Before the extinction of the Patriarchate one gleam of light illuminated the fortunes of dispersed Israel; its intensity for the moment, and its sudden extinction, only rendering more apparent the utter ruin of the national religion, and the hope of its restoration.

‘Unde altior esset
Casus, et impulsæ præceps immane ruinæ.’

The piety of the Empress Helena had made Jerusalem—the Holy City of the Jews—a very centre of Christian sanctity. Under her guidance arose the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, and every place consecrated in the memory of the devout Christian was marked for ever by some imperishable memorial; each of these fast obliterating those of the older religion, with its older traditions. Judaism seemed as if it was to be not only succeeded by, but lost in triumphant Christianity.

‘If, then, the Jews beheld with jealous alarm the rival religion seated on the imperial throne, and the votaries of Jesus clothed in the royal purple; if they felt their condition gradually becoming worse under the statutes of the new emperors; if they dreaded still further aggressions on their prosperity, they must have looked with no secret triumph to the accession of Julian, the apostate from Christianity. Before long their elation was still further excited by a letter written from the Emperor, addressed to “his brother,” the Patriarch, and the commonalty of the Jews. Julian seemed to recognise the unity of God in terms which might satisfy the most zealous follower of Moses. He proceeded to denounce their oppressors; condescended to excuse his brother; annulled the unequal taxes with which they were loaded; and expressed his earnest hope that, on his return from the Persian war, the great designs he had formed for their welfare might be fully accomplished. The temporal as well as the religious policy of Julian advised his conciliation of the Jews. Could they be lured by his splendid promises to embrace his party, the Jews in Mesopotamia would have thrown great weight into his scale in his campaign against the Persians; and, in his design of depressing Christianity, it was important to secure the support of every opposite sect. Probably, with these views, the memorable edict was issued for the rebuilding of the Temple on Mount Moriah, and the restoration of the Jewish worship in its original splendour. The execution of this project was intrusted, while Julian advanced with his ill-fated army to the East, to the care of his favourite, Alypius.

‘The whole Jewish world was in commotion; they crowded

' from the most distant quarters to be present, and to assist in
 ' the great national work. Those who were unable to come
 ' envied their more fortunate brethren, and waited in anxious
 ' hope for the intelligence that they might again send their
 ' offerings, or make their pilgrimage to the Temple of the God
 ' of Abraham, in His holy place. Their wealth was poured
 ' forth in lavish profusion; and all who were near the spot, and
 ' could not contribute so amply, offered their personal exertions:
 ' blessed were the hands that toiled in such a work; unworthy
 ' was he of the blood of Israel who would not unlock, at such a
 ' call, his most secret hoards. Men cheerfully surrendered the
 ' hard-won treasures of their avarice; women offered up the
 ' ornaments of their vanity. The very tools which were to be
 ' employed were, as it were, sanctified by the service, and were
 ' made of the most costly materials; some had shovels, mal-
 ' lets, baskets of silver; and women were seen carrying rubbish
 ' in robes and mantles of silk. Men, blind from the womb,
 ' came forward to lend their embarrassing aid; and the aged
 ' tottered along the ways, bowed beneath the weight of some
 ' burden, which they seemed to acquire new strength to support.
 ' The confidence and triumph of the Jews was unbounded;
 ' some went so far in their profane adulation as to style Julian
 ' the Messiah! The Christians looked on in consternation and
 ' amazement. Would the murderers of the Son of God be
 ' permitted to rebuild their devoted city, and the Temple arise
 ' again from the "abomination of desolation"? Materials had
 ' now accumulated from all quarters—some say at the expense
 ' of the Emperor; but that is not probable, considering the
 ' costly war in which he was engaged. Nor were the Jews
 ' wanting in ample resources: timber, stones, lime, burnt brick,
 ' clay, were heaped together in abundant quantities. Already
 ' was the work commenced; already had they dug down to a
 ' considerable depth, and were preparing to lay the foundations,
 ' when suddenly flames of fire came bursting from the centre of
 ' the hill, accompanied with terrific explosions. The affrighted
 ' workmen fled on all sides, and the labours were suspended at
 ' once by this unforeseen and awful sign. Other circumstances
 ' are said to have accompanied this event: an earthquake shook
 ' the hill; flakes of fire, which took the form of crosses, settled
 ' on the dresses of the workmen and spectators; and the fire con-
 ' sumed even the tools of iron. It was even added that a horse-
 ' man was seen careering among the flames; and that the
 ' workmen, having fled to a neighbouring church, its doors,
 ' fastened by some preternatural force within, refused to admit
 ' them. [*Sic* in text.] These, however, may be embellish-
 ' ments, and are found only in later and rhetorical writers; but

‘the main fact of the interruption of the work by some extraordinary, and, as it was supposed, preternatural interference, rests on the clear and unsuspecting testimony of the heathen *Ammianus Marcellinus*.’¹

It is said that the news of this failure reached Julian before his death, and helped to draw from him that memorable confession, ‘Thou hast conquered, O Galilean!’

It was reserved for Theodosius to put an end to this power of the Patriarch of the West. He passed an edict which stripped him of his authority by taking away his title and office of Prefect. Gamaliel, who had been accused of erecting synagogues contrary to the imperial laws, was the last of the Patriarchs: his real power had passed away when the tribute was forbidden to be collected from the Western Empire; the abolition of the office easily followed. A new order, that of Primates, succeeded: these seem rather to have been local chiefs of the dispersed Jews in various countries, than true successors of the Patriarch; the spiritual authority devolved into the hands of a Rabbinical aristocracy—an authority which has continued to our own day.

We must now pass to the rival throne of Babylon; here another order of things prevailed: the Patriarchate of Tiberias was essentially an ecclesiastical institution; the Principedom of the captivity of Babylon was rather secular. The Princes claimed—and the claim was admitted by a willing people—to be descendants of the royal house of David; they affected more the pomp of a king than the chair of the doctor. Under them, indeed, flourished the Rabbinical schools of Nahardea, Sora, and Pumbeditha, long rivals, and at last successfully so, of those of Sepphoris and Tiberias in the West: in the former, as we have before mentioned, was completed that imperishable monument of Jewish wisdom and Jewish extravagance—the Babylonian Talmud; but we must ever regard the throne of Babylon as representing to the Jewish mind the power of Solomon, rather than that of the Sanhedrim. To it the Jews fondly applied the prophecy of Jacob, ‘The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until

¹ Milman’s *Hist. of Jews*, vol. iii. pp. 181—184. Dean Milman suggests that these prodigies may be attributable to secondary causes; that in digging the foundations, the workmen came upon subterranean vaults, charged with fire-damp; this, igniting, caused the explosion, which arrested the hands of the workmen. This is very ingenious, and quite possible; but why deny the miraculous agency of the First Cause, as the Dean seems to do? He goes even further; for he argues that the miracle was unnecessary, inasmuch as the death of Julian, which immediately followed, would, by itself, have stopped the works. True; but by this line of argument the necessity of miracles at all becomes very questionable.

'Shiloh come.' Even the Patriarch of Tiberias was willing—possibly from a mere patriotic spirit—to accord to his rival the honour he claimed. 'Should the Prince of the Captivity come to Tiberias, I would do him homage,' is reported as having been said by the great Jehudah the Holy. The Talmudists of Babylon went still further, and sought to cast contempt on their brethren of Judea: 'Esra,' they said, 'left the fine flour at Babylon, and took with him only the dregs of the people.' Again: 'All the earth is an impure mass in comparison with Judea; but Judea is a corrupted mass in comparison with Babylon.' Even in the Persian empire there were degrees of pureness: 'Babylon is healthy; Mæson is dead; Media is sick; Persia is dying'—by which they meant that the Babylonian Jews were of pure blood; those of Mæson bastards; those in Media, some pure, many not; in Persia there remained few uncontaminated with foreign alliance.

Removed by locality from the influence of the Roman government, the princes could assume a state and magnificence unknown to the more unfortunate remnant of Israel in the West: the kings of Persia, who were the suzerains of the Princes of the Captivity, willingly permitted them the state of a king, and the independence of the people, in the hope that they would prove their allies in the frequent wars with the great Roman power—anxious to prevent the existence of a hostile nation in the heart of their empire.

Unfortunately, this very *éloignement* of the Jews in the East prevents us from acquiring a full and accurate knowledge of them: historians the Jews had none, not even the more humble office of chronicler; such employment was unworthy of the time and labour of the learned; other nations, they said, confine their literature to mundane matters, we labour in sacred wisdom and the knowledge of God. Among the latter they reckoned the puerilities of the fables in the Babylonian Talmud. Nor does Persia afford us much help; if records there were which could throw light on the history of this most interesting people, they have perished, or are yet to be discovered. Beyond Persia the rest of Eastern Asia lies in impenetrable darkness.¹ In the matter of dates, the Jew can very seldom be trusted; he either considers them as unworthy of accuracy, or

¹ We must make one exception to this in the discovery of a Jewish settlement in China. This colony is doubtless of great antiquity. Milman would refer the commencement to so remote a period as 58 or 75 a.c. Its synagogue was constructed to resemble the Temple, with a Holy of Holies, entered only by the High Priest; when discovered by Father Gozani, a Jesuit missionary, none had heard anything of Christianity. They were employed in agriculture and traffic, and some had even attained the rank of Mandarin.

else he wilfully falsifies them to make them agree with some Cabbalistic calculation, or, what perhaps was more frequent, to make them disagree with the Christian system, so as to escape the arguments of the latter from the prophecies of the Old Testament.

There can be no doubt that under the common name of Jew is to be comprehended the remnant of the captivity of Israel, which lingered, and, if we are to believe Dr. Wolff, still lingers yet, in the places where the Assyrian conquerors placed them. Though esteemed schismatic by their brethren of Judah, we may be sure that a common race, a common hope, a common religion, and, still more, in later times, under the horrors of the great Tatar invasion, a common misfortune, would compel them to make up their differences, and unite as one people. Neither can it be doubted that the latter cause would make many also apostates, and complete the fulfilment of that fearful prophecy, which alone is sufficient to prove the truth of inspiration:—
 ‘And the Lord shall scatter thee among all people, from the
 ‘one end of the earth even unto the other; and there thou shalt
 ‘serve other gods, which neither thou nor thy fathers have
 ‘known, even wood and stone.’¹

¹ Deut. xxviii. 64. Dr. Wolff, in his last work, gives examples of compliance with heathen religion, if it be not total apostasy. ‘Before we leave Poonah, Wolff must make mention of the *Bene Israel*, i.e. “Children of Israel,” who were resident there, for they are totally distinct from the rest of the Jews in Europe, and Hindostan. After the destruction of the first Temple in Jerusalem, their ancestors went first to Arabia, and then to Hindostan, where they have since forgotten their law; but they continue to repeat, in Hebrew, certain prayers which they have learned from other Jews They serve the English as volunteers, in their armies, and are esteemed the best native soldiers. They possess great simplicity and honesty of character, and are faithful to their wives, and, by far, more moral than the Jews of Cochin. [*Sic.*] They keep in their houses idols of wood and stone, and thus the prophecy is fulfilled, “And then ye shall serve other gods, even of wood and stone.”—Wolff, vol. ii. p. 233. ‘At last, Wolff arrived at Mished, the capital of Khorassan. Here he stayed with a Jew, the most respectable of them, Mullah-Mehder by name, in whose house Wolff had lived fourteen years before, and where he was treated in a very gentlemanly manner. Wolff asked, “How are the Jews at Meshed going on?” To his greatest horror, he learned that the whole community had become Mohammedan.’—*Ibid.* pp. 373, 374. This apostasy was in consequence of a fanatical onslaught of the Mohammedans, who, incited by a *Sayd*, or prophet, believed that the Jews had killed a dog in derision of their religion. They were offered the choice of death or conversion: they chose the latter.

‘The Jews in Bokhara, which do not call themselves Jews, but children of Israel, and who assert that they belong to the ten tribes, say that those Kapi Seeahpoosh are their brethren, whose ancestors had entirely forgotten their law, and had fallen to idolatry—but into the ancient idolatry. They call God, “Imrah,” and they worship the figure of a fish, called “Dagon.” They have in their mountains the ten commandments written upon stone; and their women observe the law of purification.’—Vol. ii. p. 37. ‘There cannot be the slightest doubt that the Jews in Khorassan, Bokhara, Samarcand, and Balk, and also in Shahr-sabz, as well as the descendants of Tchingis Khan, and the Nogay Tatars, and those called of the tribe of Naphtali, are all remnants of the ten tribes. This is not

Over this united people, by the permission of the Kings of Persia, was established that singular *imperium in imperio*, the rule of the Princes of the Captivity. The oriental mind, which ever glories in pomp and display, and esteems the greatness of the people to be in proportion with the distance between themselves and their monarch, had invented a ceremonial for the installation of their prince, which might rival the magnificence of Solomon, who was the type of all greatness and glory in the eye of the Jew. We give the following account from Basnage:—

‘The Princes of the Captivity were installed with much pomp and ceremony. For this purpose the heads of the neighbouring schools, the senators, and the people, gathered in crowds to the city of Babylon. An assembly was formed, and the prince, whom they believed to be of the lineage of David, was seated on a kind of throne; then the head of the School of Sora exhorted him not to abuse his power, and represented to him that he was called to a state of captivity rather than to an empire, because of the sad condition of the people. On the following Thursday the heads of schools laid their hands on him in the synagogue, accompanied by the blast of trumpets, and the acclamations of the people. The latter, after conducting him to his palace in procession, brought him rich presents. On Saturday morning all the personages of distinction assembled at his palace; he placed himself at their head, and, departing from his house, with a veil of silk over his face, proceeded to the synagogue, followed by a vast crowd, while the heads of the schools and the singers chanted hymns and benedictions before his throne. Then was brought to him the Book of the Law, of which he read the first line; after this he made an oration to the people, with his eyes closed out of respect. Should he not be able to do this the head of the school supplied his place. He enlarged, above all things, on charity to the scholars, himself setting the example by bestowing large alms; the rest immediately followed his example. The ceremony concluded by the acclamations of the people, and prayers to God that deliverance might be brought to the nation under his reign. He then gave the benediction, and prayed particularly for each province that God would protect it from pestilence and war; the rest of the prayer was said in a low voice, so as not to reach the ears of any, lest his words might be repeated to his suzerain or other kings, for he prayed that the kingdom of the Jews might rise on the ruins of other monarchies. Coming

an hypothesis, but a relation of their own assertions. As to the Kafir Seeahpoosh, Wolff strongly suspects them to be the same; but he cannot prove it, as he never heard it asserted by the Seeahpoosh themselves.—*Ibid.* p. 62.

'out of the synagogue, he was again conducted with great ceremony to his palace, where he made a feast to the great men of the nation. From this time he never went out except on visits of ceremony to the schools, when a great crowd accompanied him, and all rose up to receive him; and on those occasions when he went to pay his respects to the suzerain of Babylon [Baghdad]. Again, as before, this affair was one of great magnificence. The king, being informed of his intention, sent him his own chariot; the prince of the captivity did not dare to accept the offer, but caused it to advance before him, as a mark of his respect and dependence. He was arrayed in a magnificent robe of cloth of gold, fifty guards marched before him; all who met him made it a matter of duty to follow him to the palace. There eunuchs received him, and conducted him to the throne, while his officers scattered gold and silver around. Approaching the throne he prostrated himself on the earth, to show that he was a vassal and a subject; the eunuchs lifted him up, and placed him on a seat on the left of the king. After the first salutation the prince laid before his suzerain the grievances and the state of affairs of his people, for the latter to redress.'¹

The Resch-Glutha, or Prince of the Captivity, held his court with true oriental magnificence; we read of satraps, councillors, and cup-bearers. The Jews of the East were many of them wealthy, they were merchants and artisans, as well as followers of their ancestral employment of husbandmen and shepherds; and no doubt willingly paid their taxes to keep up the glory of their prince. Their great pride was, however, in the schools of learning; the fame of those of Sepphoris and Tiberias in the West only stimulated the schools of Nahardea, Sora, and Pumbeditha, to a generous rivalry. This *imperium* lasted till the eleventh century: in the twelfth a mere *nominis umbra*, a Jew who called himself the Prince, without any royal power, was found by Benjamin of Tudela, when he visited Baghdad; the irruption of the Mongul conquerors, the dissolution of the Persian monarchy, and the revolutions caused by the Mohammedan wars, swept away the *imperium* of the Resch-Glutha, as they did those of greater and stronger monarchs. Yet with a pertinacity peculiarly Jewish, and an unchangeableness essentially oriental, the title is still retained to this day.²

We are not to suppose, however, that the sun shone upon the Princes of the Captivity during this time without a cloud, or

¹ Basnage, Liv. iii. chap. 4, § 7. The above is a free translation.

² 'The Jews are mighty and rich in Bagdad, and many are learned among them, and their great man has still the title, "The Prince of Captivity."'—Wolff, vol. i. p. 327.

that he ever found his suzerain so compliant : from the death of R. Asche, who commenced the Babylonian Talmud, the days of the children of the captivity were indeed dark. The race of Persian monarchs from Izdigerdes to Kobad (430 to 530) were Magians, and persecutors both of Jew and Christian ; sabbath and Lord's-day were alike prohibited, though the schools were still open. In the midst of this external violence, internal strife prevailed ; the heads of the schools would not endure that the Prince, though acknowledged to be of the House of David, should interpret the Talmud in the presence of the Rabbin. Huna, the Resch-Glutha, presumed to do this : R. Chanina, master of the schools, and Huna's father-in-law, forbad him : Huna privately insulted Chanina, and publicly interdicted his subjects from receiving him, or supplying him with the necessaries of life. Chanina prayed in secret, and it seemed as if his prayers were heard, for a pestilence carried off every living member of the royal line, leaving only his pregnant daughter. The history, or legend, goes on to say that Chanina dreamed that he stood in a garden, where he had cut down all the cedar trees, one small sapling alone remaining : on awaking, he believed the dream to signify that he had caused the destruction of David's line, and that it was his remaining duty to tend the unborn infant : day and night he watched at his daughter's door, till the child was born, which, from that hour, became the sole object of his care and thought. In due time, the young Zutra succeeded to his father's honours ; his reign was short ; an impostor, named Meir, brought it to an untimely end. Most probably pretending to be the Messiah, he gathered a band of four hundred men, and devastated the country, giving out that a fiery pillar preceded his march : the Persian monarch Kobad soon quelled the insurrection, and took fearful vengeance on the unhappy children of the captivity ; Zutra and Chanina were hanged, and the Jews dispersed. A son of the former fled to Tiberias, when he renewed the Semicha, or laying on of hands. The Jews of the East made peace with the Persian monarch, and tried to persuade him into war with the Roman empire by a promise of fifty thousand troops as a contingent, and the plunder of Christian Jerusalem. Wars, insurrections, conspiracies, succeeded each other, in which the Jews seemed always destined to be on the losing side, and to suffer the extremities of unsuccessful war. If there was a struggle for the throne of Persia, they took the part of the defeated candidate ; if an insurrection was planned, they lost all by impatiently anticipating the right moment for rising, thus leaving themselves to the easy vengeance of the successful power. Once, indeed, they did possess the ever-coveted capital of their forefathers, under the protection of

their Persian allies, with full permission to work their will there: every church was demolished, the glorious building of Helena and Constantine, including the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, given over to the flames: 'the devout offerings of three hundred years were rifled in one sacrilegious day:' it is said that ninety thousand Christians suffered death, most of them in cold blood. Their triumph was short; the Emperor Heraclius marched to the relief of the Holy City; the old decrees of Hadrian were put in force; the Christians called upon the emperor to make atonement in Jewish blood, while he gladly restored the churches and buildings of the recovered city in more than former magnificence. Arabian conquests, however, soon changed equally the fortunes of Jew and Christian; the Holy City, coveted alike by either, was soon lost to both; the Crescent supplanted the Cross, and on the razed site of the Temple was erected the Mosque of Omar.

We should not be completing our sketch of the history of the Jews in the East were we to pass over in silence the great question of the Ten Tribes: we need not remind our readers of the many solutions that have been given to this historical crux, in which almost every peculiar nation, from the Anglo-Saxon down to the wandering gipsy, has been claimed for the remnant of Israel. Basnage mentions the theories of his time of the Israelitish origin of the Tatars and Red Indians; we need not say that a more correct knowledge of the races of mankind has long ago exploded these notions. At the present day the Affghans are claimed by some, while Dr. Wolff would assign the honour to the Nestorians of Persia. We are afraid that we must say that all these claims seem to us to rest upon very little foundation; few of those who have been so ready with their conjectures have really qualified themselves for a judgment on the point by investigating in a calm and impartial manner—perhaps not in any manner at all—the history of Israel since its dispersion; and yet, without such investigation, every conjecture must be utterly baseless. How few, *e.g.* have studied even Basnage, or Buxtorf, or Jöst, to say nothing of Josephus and the Talmudists. Dean Milman, though he evidently had Basnage lying before him when writing his history, does not enter into any discussion on the question; while others entertain the question, or rather entertain us with their wild guesses, without any competent knowledge of the subject. How often we are told, for instance, that the Samaritans of our Lord's time were descendants of the Ten Tribes, instead of being those of the heathen nations introduced by Shalmaneser; how completely is the address of the Epistle of S. James, 'to the twelve tribes scattered abroad,' ignored, and such casual notices as that

of S. Paul (Acts xxvi. 7), 'our twelve tribes instantly serving God day and night;' and again (S. Luke ii. 36), 'Anna, a prophetess, the daughter of Phanuel, of the tribe of Aser,' overlooked. We intend to give, at the sacrifice of all mystery, our reasons for supposing, as we have casually mentioned above, that the Ten Tribes have been long ago incorporated into the remnant of Judah and Benjamin, and included in the common name of 'Jews.'¹ On this point the Talmudists are agreed; the passage we quoted about the corruption of Jewish blood in the phrase 'Mæson is dead, Media is sick, Persia is dying,' referred quite as much to marriages with the Ten Tribes as with heathen.

The Israelites were placed by the king of Assyria 'in Halah and Habor, by the river of Gozan, in the cities of the Medes.' The Talmudists inform us that in their day Halah is Halvaoth; Habor is Adiabene; the river Gozan is Ginzak. Ptolemy speaks of Chaboras, Chalatis, and Ganzanitis; there is little difficulty in identifying these names. Again, we have in the Talmud directions about marriage, 'provision is made concerning espousals, that they contract not with any of the ten tribes.' Again, we read in Ezra (ii. 64), that only forty-two thousand three hundred and threescore returned to Jerusalem; of those only about thirty thousand are reckoned by families; perhaps the other ten thousand were of the ten tribes. Again, it is not quite clear that the whole of Galilee was carried captive by Shalmaneser to an equal extent with Samaria. The application of the prophecy (S. Matt. iv. 14), 'The land of Zabulon, and the land of Nephthalim, by the way of the sea, beyond Jordan, Galilee of the Gentiles; the people that sat in darkness have seen great light; and to them which sat in the region and shadow of death, light is sprung up,' would hardly be applicable, unless a remnant at least of those tribes remained there. Further, when King Josiah restored

¹ 'The making of seventy-two elders to be sent to Alexandria from Jerusalem on this occasion [the translation of the LXX.] and these to be chosen by six out of every tribe, by the advice of Demetrius Phalereus, all looks like a Jewish invention, framed with respect to the Jewish sanhedrim, and the number of the twelve tribes of Israel; it not being likely that Demetrius, an heathen Greek, should know anything of their twelve tribes, or of the number of the seventy-two elders, of which their sanhedrim did consist. *The names of Israel, and of the twelve tribes, were then absorbed in that of the Jews, and few knew of them in that age by any other appellation.* Although some of the other tribes joined themselves to the Jews on their return from the Babylonish captivity, as I have before observed, and these by the names of those tribes might still be preserved among their descendants, yet it is not to be supposed that all were so; but that some of the names of those other tribes were wholly lost, and no more in being in the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus; and that, therefore, no such choice could then be made out of them for the composing of this version.'—*Prideaux's Connexion*, Pt. ii. Book I. pp. 51, 52.

the religion of Judah, he extended his reformation to the extinct kingdom of Israel, showing pretty clearly that a large number of Israelites still inhabited that country, and that he was permitted by its suzerain to exercise a certain control over the inhabitants.¹

From all these premisses, we think we may fairly draw the following conclusions; that a large number of the ten tribes remained in the northern parts of the ancient kingdom of Israel, after the captivity of Shalmaneser, whose descendants were known as 'Galileans' in the Gospel history, and that the southern part only, viz. Samaria, was settled by strangers from the East; that a considerable number—perhaps about ten thousand—returned with Ezra from Babylon; for these it was, as well as the Galileans, that Ezra offered 'twelve bullocks for all Israel' (viii. 35); that another large portion remains to this day in the places to which they were carried captive, and are known under the general title of 'Jews.' Maimonides confesses that in his time all distinction of tribe and family had been lost.² We must also give some credence to the conjecture of Lightfoot, viz., that a considerable body of these were converted to Christianity by the preaching of the Apostles;

¹ 'But now, if the seats, cities, countries, of the ten tribes in the times of the Talmudists, were so well known, much more were they so in the times of the Apostles; which were not so far removed from their first captivity. That people, therefore, skulked not [*latuit*] in I know not what unknown land (a thing now conceived of them), but that the preaching of the Apostles came also to them, as well as to other nations. One may say this with the greatest assurance, upon the credit of S. James, who writes his Epistle to the whole twelve tribes,—and also upon the credit of the Apocalyptic, in whom the twelve tribes are sealed, chap. vii. And the words of our Saviour argue the same thing respecting the twelve apostles, that were to judge the twelve tribes, implying, that they all twelve heard the sound of the Gospel, concerning the reception or rejection of which that judgment was to be.

'Under this notion, unless I am much mistaken, is the apostle to be understood treating of the calling of Israel, Rom. xi.; not of the Jews only, but of the whole twelve tribes of Israel, δωδεκάφυλον. And this is that mystery, concerning which he speaks at ver. 25, namely, that hardness, or "blindness happened to Israel ἀπὸ μέρους, by parts, or separately;" first, the ten tribes were blinded,—some hundreds of years after, the two tribes; and both the one and the other remained under that state, until the fulness of the Gentiles came in, when the Gospel entered, and "so all Israel," δωδεκάφυλος, "the whole twelve tribes," namely, they who were the λείμμα, "the remnant," κατ' ἐκλογὴν χάριτος, "according to the election of grace," ver. 1, were saved. . . . And so (which is a great mystery), first, the Gentiles were blinded; and, after them, the ten tribes were blinded; and, after them, the two tribes were blinded; all lying under that miserable condition, until all at last were enlightened by the Gospel, and closed together in one body. And that the apostle spake of his own times when the Gospel was newly brought to the Gentiles, he himself sufficiently ratifies and makes known by those words, Ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ, "At this present time," ver. 5.—*Lightfoot, Talmudical Exercitations on the First Ep. to Cor.*

² 'Hinc Familiæ inter nos confusæ sunt, ita ut dignosci nequeant inter se, nec e locis ipsorum cognosci.—*Maimon. De Lotione Manuum*, c. iv. § 4.

perhaps that the greater part of the Oriental Christians in the first century was composed of converted Jews and Israelites; that they, in successive generations, lost their peculiarities of race and feature, through intermarriage and abandoning of peculiar customs. Perhaps there may be some truth in Dr. Wolff's conjecture of the Israelitish origin of the Persian Nestorians; and finally, that a great number adopted the idolatry of the countries in which they lived, and have lost their nationality; that a fearful destruction of them took place under the Tatar invaders.

We have confined ourselves strictly to the limits allowed by the title of this article, and have omitted much connected with the history of dispersed Israel of exceeding interest—*e.g.* the Platonic development in Alexandria; the Homeritic kingdom in Arabia; and the doubtful one of Kozar. The first is worthy of an article by itself; for the second, we must refer our readers to Gibbon and Milman; for the last, to Basnage.

ART. IV.—*Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury.* By W. F. Hook, D.D. Dean of Chichester. Vol. I. Anglo-Saxon Period. London: Bentley.

THIS volume, its able author tells us, 'comprises the history of the Anglo-Saxon Church.' It would have been a more acceptable gift to English Churchmen had it really done so. To have to piece out our knowledge of the *origines* of our own Church from Southey and Inett and Soames and Lingard,—from the sparkling points made by an essayist, or the flat pages of the dullest of chroniclers who has not even the merit of knowing facts, or the polemics of a controversialist, or the disquisitions, however large-minded, of a Roman Catholic,—is a state of things not creditable to our Church literature. And few tasks could have better occupied the Dean of Chichester, than to use the well-earned leisure that crowns the noblest of practical lives, in tracing the growth of that English Christianity, the sturdy strength of which he has himself under God done so much in these latter days to renew. The subtle unravelling of metaphysical controversies is not in Dr. Hook's line. And to trace the process of compacting the Papacy out of the Latinized European Churches, has been the larger task of the leisure of another English Dean. It would have been a work most interesting to English Churchmen, and most congenial to all the antecedents of Dr. Hook, to depict the growth of the most unmetaphysical and most un-Latinized of Churches, the Church not of subtle controversy but of practical work, the Church which of all was most truly a national Church, and that Church our own. Here, and here only, the older Britannico-Roman Church organization was swept away from its foundations. And the Italian graft did not take kindly to the oak in which it was grafted, and was quickly overpowered. And the terrors of a journey through Frank-land or the Alps, and the un-Latinized Anglo-Saxon tongue, and the absence of all elements whatsoever of the old Roman Empire, kept foreign influences of all kinds practically apart; and reduced to a sentiment, the more strong because its strength was almost never tested, the romantic, childlike, and happily ignorant reverence felt by the Anglo-Saxon towards the distant and civilised and apostolical mother Church of Rome. And the Church of our forefathers accordingly grew from its own roots, a Church beyond all others national. And that Church was also emphatically the Missionary Church of the time. What the Scot did in the sixth and seventh centuries, was the work of the Anglo-Saxon in the eighth. Mission work was his special work. Where he planted the Gospel,

it took root and lasted. And as abroad, so at home, it was a Church of specially practical and pastoral labour. The *parochia* (in the final and narrowest sense of the word) of Churches across the water was significantly the 'shriftshire' of our own. And the parish priest with his parish church dates from days as early as those of Theodore. And though the formal words of Baptism and of the Mass were only explained and not translated (as Lappenberg seems to think), and the Council of Cloveshoo under Cuthbert only regretted without altering the chanting of psalms in an unknown tongue; yet the Creed, and the Lord's Prayer, and the words of promise in the Marriage Service, and perhaps some other things were in the vernacular, and the two first were enforced as a necessary knowledge on all; and Saxon sermons were preached every Sunday; and prose and verse Psalms and the Gospels in Saxon were as familiar as in the days of MSS. they could be; and the Lord's-day was kept, or ordered to be kept, much after the English ideal of the present day. And the system of the Penitentials, which, though we may well doubt the wisdom of the means adopted, was yet the first grand attempt to realise systematically through pastoral care the Christian life throughout the flock, did not indeed arise, but received its first great development in the Church of our Saxon fathers. Add to this the characteristic Saxon pilgrimages, linking us with Rome, with Jerusalem, and even in the ninth century with India, and importing in return the learning and refinement of foreign lands: and the singular fervour of devotion, which counts so unparalleled a beadrill of Saxon kings and queens and nobles, not among the founders only, but among the devoted and world-renouncing monks of ascetic monasteries: and the later religious guilds and brotherhoods, framed no doubt after the doctrine of the day, but indicating a real and devotional Christian feeling; and the pre-eminent learning and piety of the Northumbrian Church above all, with its Cuthbert and John of Beverley, its Bedes and Alcuins and Egberts, showing its vitality even in the day of its captivity, in the romantic and touching faith of the bearers of S. Cuthbert's corpse. Surely here is a subject, which with the flood of light poured upon it by recent antiquarian labours (still, however, sadly incomplete and imperfect), would well repay the historian's toil. And who better than Dr. Hook (if he will but get up his facts) to describe a Church, into the spirit of which he can so largely enter, and whose life and tone his peculiar experience and kindred feeling will so truly appreciate and understand?

However, we must be thankful for what we have, if Dr. Hook will give us no more. He has chosen to limit himself to a single and narrow side-view as it were of this larger subject.

He has tied himself to a line of official biographies ; and must needs follow where they lead him, even though they turn him aside from flowery meads to barren sands, or whirl him like a railroad along their own unswerving line, now and then indeed to a glorious prospect from some lofty embankment, but too commonly along a blind cutting, or by the backs of the suburbs of the cities which he passes, instead of to the busy marts and palaces which are the centres of their real life. No doubt our Saxon line of primates contains its fair sprinkling of great names. There are, it must be owned, to set against them, Tatwins and Bregwins in the list, of whom like the Moores and the Herrings of a later date we have to remind ourselves by the help of Mr. Stubbs's '*Registrum Anglicanum*,' that they did once inhabit respectively their monastic or palatial homes of Canterbury or Lambeth. And the ingenuity with which Dr. Hook has devised an agreeable digression to hang upon such barren pegs is amusing. But for the most part our Archbishops were at least men who lived a life worth telling. On the other hand, they were rarely the leading men of the time. Our objection to the plan of such biographies—and they threaten to become common, since Lord Campbell set the fashion,—is that they take us only now and then to the real moving spring of events, while commonly they are compelled to make some secondary, though we own usually interesting, person the principal figure in the picture, and to tell us only by the bye what we chiefly care to know. The life of Dunstan, which Dr. Hook has treated in the noblest spirit, and perhaps that of Augustine, are almost the only periods throughout the volume in which things fall naturally into their right position, and where Dr. Hook's point of view coincides with that which an unfettered historian would take. That of Theodore, which can alone claim to be parallel with these, divides its interest with the contemporary and more brilliant and erratic career of Wilfrid, and the latter is unhappily spoiled in Dr. Hook's pages by a singular and inexcusable ignorance of the common facts of the history itself. But take Alfred's reign, and how exceedingly is the story marred and mutilated by the unavoidable disproportion with which it is here treated ! Who ever heard of Ethelred, or who but an editor of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle of Plegmund, as having any appreciable share in the truly English reforms, which Alfred (and if any one beside him, Asser) originated and accomplished ? Yet it is Ethelred and Plegmund to whom Dr. Hook is compelled to refer his narrative. And except in these three periods,—those of Theodore, Alfred, and Dunstan,—our archbishops present a series of good men, above rather than below the average bishop, yet rarely taking the lead in works of

more vital interest than the securing the privileges of their archiepiscopate, or the giving a triumph to one or other of two rival monasteries through the contingent advantages of possessing their graves.

In truth the accident which gave Canterbury the primacy, did not preserve to it in Saxon times the real or continued leadership of the English Church. Canterbury schools and Canterbury plain song were in repute in England only so long as Italian refinement had still something to impart to Saxon ignorance. And Egbert's school at York speedily superseded the former; while Wilfrid's boasted improvements in the antiphonal chant, and Aldhelm's nationalizing of church music, eclipsed the latter. And Glastonbury, again, was the great school of later times. The monastic life drew its inspiration from Lindisfarne, or from Wilfrid at Ripon, or from Malmesbury and Glastonbury, but not until Dunstan's time from Canterbury. The monastery of Ripon, again, under the same Wilfrid, originated the spirit of missionary enterprise, and the Wessex monasteries supplied a Boniface to improve upon the lesson; but though the latter sought Archbishop Brihtwald's blessing, he took with him the commendatory letters of his own Wessex Bishop, and looked to him for guidance in the instruction of his heathen converts. And the curious letter of the Bishop of London of the same date, in the Appendix to Smith's Bede, discloses a very disjointed condition of the southern province, and little submission to Canterbury. The Lichfield schism followed at no long interval. And it was not until the Danes had wasted the Northumbrian Church, and Athelstan had made England one kingdom, that even a technical primacy over the whole country was yielded without dispute to the Southern Kentish See, to be disputed yet again in Norman times, and settled at length and for ever by the efforts of Lanfranc.

A series of well written biographies, however,—to turn from Dr. Hook's choice of subject to his treatment of it,—is always an amusing book, though it is not a history. Anecdote and personal adventure come home to every one. And biographies written with the humour, the weighty sense, and the large and generous spirit of Dr. Hook, and dealing with a state of society at once sufficiently akin and sufficiently alien to our own to awaken both sympathy and curiosity, form a volume that reads in many parts like a novel for interest. And if to understand the men of our own time be a condition of writing sensibly the history of those who lived before us—or if, again, to have taken a manly and vigorous part in existing controversies prepare the mind most thoroughly for a just and equitable estimate of both sides in those that are past—or if a large spiritual experience

be specially helpful to keep a Church historian awake to the hidden stream of the inner Christian life, and to teach him to detect its signs under the ritual, or the æsthetics, or the politics, or the worldly fortunes of the Church, however obscured by them, or however alien to modern habits of thought—or if, once more, a mind trained by action rather than by study, and versed in men rather than books, be apt to be specially ready with comparisons, grotesque or weighty, but in either case vivid, and with trains of thought that link the new to the old, and give life to the latter by bringing them at once to the range of our own experience;—all these qualifications the greatest among our pastoral clergy assuredly has, and his book bears traces of them in every page. He lacks indeed one qualification, necessary perhaps to the highest class of biography—an enthusiastic admiration of his heroes. His tone towards the Anglo-Saxon Church is a curious compound of candour and contempt—of candour, intentional, deliberate, self-reminding, which covers an involuntary and for ever self-rebuking contempt. His book is almost an expansion of the thesis, the formal propounding of which occupies its earliest pages:—that, while everybody knows and nobody can deny how utterly unenlightened our forefathers were, yet for all that the nineteenth century would be wise not to throw stones. Strip accident from essentials, and judge men from their own point of view, and there is not so much to choose after all, he tells us, in the greater matters of intellect, morals, or religion, between the dark ages and our own. And this candour has both an apologetic and a satirical side, and both double-edged. He is so alive to the foibles of the present age, and so determined to be fair towards those of the past, as to let slip no opportunity of an innocently suggested parallel, by which both are placed on a level, and contemptuous modern readers are left in the dilemma of acquitting or condemning their ignorant forefathers as they please, but in either case of dealing a like measure to themselves. A modern revivalist is thus let in for a defence, *nolens volens*, of mediæval belief in still continued miracles. And Dunstan's alleged ventriloquist tricks are most ingeniously sheltered under a parallel with anonymous letters in the *Times* or elsewhere. And the wise man and the mesmerizer are exhibited to rebuke the contemptuous sneer on the face of the enlightened reader at the recourse for the like reasons in older times to the relics and graves of saints. And the idleness of the Canterbury students are excused by modern University example, and serves (*proh pudor!*) as a peg whereon to hang in Dr. Hook's own person a defence of University fox-hunting! The result, however, is a most amusing narrative, written in a piquant style, and yet by no means wanting in the

serious thought and reverent tone befitting its main subject. Dr. Hook indeed has a knack of visibly realising the past to his readers. He is apt at such happy allusions, as the comparison of a Saxon royal palace to the camp at Aldershot, or as when the longs and shorts of Aldhelm, or the young noblemen at Glastonbury, wake us up to quaint imaginations of an Anglo-Saxon Eton. While a lively style only sets off in his pages those higher intellectual and moral qualifications of an historian for which this volume establishes a high claim.

It is a duty which may not be left undone to accompany this praise by a remark of a different kind. Unhappily, Dr. Hook, with all these loftier powers, is deficient in certain lower historical qualities. It would not be fair, indeed, to treat his work as that of an original investigator. His aim apparently has been simply to use the materials which are now readily accessible, in order to popularize them into an interesting volume, which should teach men, in a fair and religious spirit, what the beginnings of the English Church really were. He does not enter, accordingly, into disputed or complicated questions of fact. He is content with assuming, for instance, that Augustine really went to Arles for consecration, or that he died when Wharton says he did. Nor will he settle where he landed, or what was the locality of the conference of the oak. The Welshman will look in vain in his pages for a defence, or even for a bare mention, of Dinoh's antedated zeal against a papal supremacy that was not claimed. And so throughout his work. One little bit of an unexplained itinerary of Archbishop Siric, hitherto unpublished, is, we believe, Dr. Hook's entire contribution to the facts and authorities of Saxon Church history. So far we do not complain that Dr. Hook has contented himself with breathing life and character into materials of other people's collecting, without any extreme research towards supplementing or correcting them; but we are constrained to say that he is by no means exact in representing even the authorities which he had before his eyes. In the effort to frame a living picture out of the details of the chroniclers, he is guilty both of frequent inadvertencies in matters of fact, and of imputing motives and asserting explanations without adequate support in his original authorities. The utter confusion which he has made of the history of Wilfrid and Deusdedit is perhaps the most serious case of the first kind. Benedict Biscop's nationality is of less importance, but might as well be right as wrong. He was an Angle, not a Briton. M. Schrödl, we fear, will insinuate worse things of the mention of wine as well as bread,¹ in the story of Mellitus and the pagan

¹ M. Schrödl overlooks the epithet *nitidus* in the farfetched argument for communion in one kind which he founds (or borrows) on this passage. It was some-

sons of Sabert. And the translation of Aldfrith's final reply to Wilfrid in 704, is worse still. Dr. Hook's rendering implies that the *ut dicitis*, 'as you call it,' applied to the epithet 'apostolic see,' instead of to the letter produced by Wilfrid, and asserted by him to be from the apostolic see; and it omits the contrast drawn between the Archbishop sent by the Pope, and the letter brought from the Pope—one though not the main point of the reply turning on the superiority of the more indisputable genuineness of the living messenger as compared with the written message. We could add a great many, too many more of similar slips. The statement that Cuthbert prompted the letter of Boniface to king Æthelbald, or that he agreed with Boniface¹ in desiring to make the see of Rome the centre of unity; or, in an earlier narrative, that Redwald had invited the Canterbury missionaries to his court; or, again, nearly all of the speculations attributed to Wilfrid, or others about him, respecting the see of Canterbury, are specimens of the latter class. The former are, of course, indefensible. With respect to the latter, it may be difficult to draw a line in the mode of statement between the rationale of facts as actually stated by original witnesses, and the allowable framework which all historians must devise to combine and account for them. But surely it falls beyond this line, when conjectural interpretations of the modern thinker are stated as though they were simple assertions of the original witness. And of this it is that we hold Dr. Hook too often guilty. He possesses many of the higher powers that go to make a great historian. May we be forgiven for reminding him that the foundation ought to come before the building, and that reflections, however profound, lose credit in direct proportion to their profoundness, when, unhappily, that to which they refer turns out to have no existence. We cannot forbear asking—that we may conclude in good humour our unavoidable notice of an unpleasant topic, whether the Dean of Chichester, in his cathedral, or in his private oratory, actually keeps S. Gregory's and S. Augustine's days with a special service as old as A.D. 747 or thereabouts; and if so, whether he would favour us with an inspection of so scarce a liturgical document? Our 'present Prayer-books,' he tells us, have festivals in honour of these two saints, after the fashion established in Cuthbert's synod of Cloveshoo. Really, we have been in sad ignorance.

thing in the bread, not in the wine, that attracted the eye of the heathen princes. But Dr. Hook should not have slipped in an express mention of wine which Bede says nothing about.

¹ Why does Dr. Hook call the Council of which Boniface transmits the decrees to Cuthbert, a Council of *Soissons*? It was somewhere in Germany, no one knows where. But at Soissons assuredly it was not. It was held under Carloman, and therefore in Austrasia.

We begin to fear that Mr. Fisher may have had some shadow of reason, after all, for what we have hitherto regarded (nay, do still regard) as disingenuous on his part to the degree of dishonesty—namely, his implied assertion that English Churchmen, or some of them, keep, not indeed these two, but another of the black letter days, that, if we remember right, of S. Margaret.

Space would not allow us to follow Dr. Hook through the whole period which his volume—we cannot say, describes, but—covers; through the details of the Celtic controversy; of the constitution of the Saxon Church, now re-entered into the European fraternity of Churches, under Theodore; of the political controversy touching metropolitans, which again nearly shattered her; of the degeneracy into which both Church and State had sunk when the sharp chastisement of the Danish ‘army’ came to pour new blood into the enfeebled frame of both; of the reform under Alfred; of the revolution under Dunstan; of the counter-revolution and the great development of the regal supremacy under the Danish dynasty; of the merely political strife of races that degraded even the Church during the feeble days of the Confessor. Let us confine ourselves to the two characters who were respectively the nominal and the real founders of the Anglo-Saxon Church as she was in her best days—to Augustine and to Theodore. In both sketches we shall trace the true appreciation of human nature, and the inadequate investigation of facts, which distinguish Dr. Hook’s pages. In both we shall be brought on the track of Church questions such as are not yet obsolete. The lines laid down for the yet unbuilt missionary edifice, and the due adjustment of episcopal and of pastoral superintendence and the desirableness of synodical action in the now completed Church, are as living questions still to the Selwyns and the Mackenzies on the one hand, and to the Wilberforces on the other, and to ourselves their fellow-churchmen, as they were to the Italian and the Greek who were sent to settle them in England in the seventh century.

I. If any man ever had greatness thrust upon him, with which, Malvolio-like, he did not quite know how to deal, that man was Augustine of Canterbury. The Pope and his missionary remind us of nothing more forcibly than of some Arnold or Moberly trying, by mingled rebukes, advice, and warning, to get a timid and awkward boy to act his part properly in the semi-independent sphere of prefect or monitor. Scarcely able to tear himself from the side of the truly great man on whom he leaned—shrinking back from exaggerated difficulties the moment he found himself alone—delaying on the threshold of his enterprise an unreasonable time, yet strangely ignorant, at the end of this

delay, of the true position of the Celtic Churches,¹ already in the land to which he was sent, and still needing interpreters to enable him to preach to his future flock—asking with solemnity the simplest of questions, such as a novice might have settled without troubling the Pope, a thousand miles off, about the matter—catching too readily at immediate and worldly aids to success—and when success came unduly elated—ignoring altogether the pioneers whom he found at work before him, and sensitively proud and unconciliatory towards supposed rivals—Augustine has one claim to our respect, that of a blameless and self-denying Christian life. The one truly missionary soul in Rome (as Dr. Hook justly says) would seem to have been that of Gregory himself. The men to whom he delegated, perforce, his cherished missionary enterprise, were no doubt the best he could find; but it tells ill for the Roman Church of the day, that five years of his papacy passed before he could find even such as they, while six years more elapsed, and three of them after the arrival of Augustine's tidings of his first success, before another band could be mustered to reinforce them. And just one other, and he not from Rome,² and (though consecrated) not sent by the then Pope (Honorius), fills up, at an interval of above thirty years, the entire missionary band which Italy could supply to counterbalance the past Arianism of northern and the coming Islamism of eastern invaders, by new conquests from heathendom. The contrast is a pregnant one, between this scanty, spasmodic, and tardy effort, made with difficulty and not followed up, and the endless flood of self-denying and devoted men who at this very period were pouring out of the Celtic Churches, and carrying the Gospel from the north to every point at which European heathendom could be reached, even up to and over the Alps themselves.

In 595, the abbot of S. Andrew's at Rome quitted his Italian cloister to begin his journey. He did not land in Thanet until 597. Dr. Hook, we think, has rested the account of the delay too much upon the dangers of the journey itself. The need of learning the language, which Franks could teach, was probably its excuse. The '*iners timor*,' to which Bede honestly owns, of the '*fera et barbara et incredula gens cuius ne linguam quidem nossent*,' was plainly in part its cause. Aided by Candidus, the Pope's agent for S. Peter's patrimony in Gaul,—an officer requiring for his duties as much courage and tact, it

¹ See the letter of Archbishop Laurentius in Bede, H. E. ii. 4.

² Thirty years or so further still, after Birinus' mission, and two more were with difficulty found by the Pope to accept Saxon archbishoprics and abbacies. They were a Greek and an African, Theodore and Hadrian.

should seem, as an Irish land-agent of sixty years since, and certainly a capital courier for timid voyagers,—Augustine and his band were, nevertheless, a whole year (spent partly in plying Gregory with an entreaty to be excused their undertaking altogether), before they ventured beyond the comparatively home-quarters of Lerins and Aix. Although armed with credentials (such as Gregory could give) to Frank kings and bishops, from Metz eastward to the strangely out-of-the-way Saintes on the west,¹—omitting however, singularly enough, the king of the still little kingdom of Soissons, which contained all the then ordinary ports of communication with non-Celtic England,—they were a year more before they actually stood on the shore of that nation of fierce countenance whose tongue they could not understand, and which had loomed so terrific across the haze of the distant Channel to their untravelled and unadventurous eyes. Yet the subsequent letters of thanks from Gregory to (among others) Queen Brunehaut and Bishop Syagrius of Autun, including this time Lothaire also of Soissons, and the presence of ‘Gallic priests’ and ‘Frank interpreters’ in their band, prove their journey to have been forwarded, both by Church and State, by Gaul and Fränk, rather than impeded. While the simple fact of the Christian queen, and her Christian bishop, living in the undisturbed practice of Christian worship in a Christian church in Canterbury itself, might have taught them that the spirit of martyrdom, however admirable, was in their case superfluous.

We trace a like want of loftiness of spirit in their actual missionary labours. Like Dr. Hook, we will assume the circumstances of the landing; not venturing to intrude upon the field which Dr. Stanley has made unapproachably his own. Let it suffice also to note with ungrudging admiration the evangelic and simple teaching which tradition assigns to Augustine’s first address—tradition, however, recorded at no earlier date than that of Ælfric, and expanded, seemingly, by Gotselin (whom Dr. Hook quotes) on his own authority—and the manly and sensible wisdom of Ethelbert’s reply,—strange contrast to the savage vision that had haunted the timid anticipations of the mis-

¹ Laurentius, in one of his *later* journeys across France, visited Columbanus, it is to be supposed at Luxeuil, but only to increase seemingly his unchristian antipathy to Celts (Bede, *h. e.* ii. 4). Dates render it questionable whether Augustine could have taken the like step himself, had he been so disposed; but his letters of introduction to Orleans, to Tours, and to Saintes, may have been intended to help him to an interview with British bishops in Britany, *e. g.* with Maclou of S. Aleth. The legends about his miracles in Anjou, are worth hardly so much as to be mentioned, but they help to confirm his visit to these parts. Candidus, mentioned in the text, certainly did visit Columbanus subsequently. He may have assisted Laurentius to do the like.

sionaries,—and the wise pomp with which, ‘more suo’ (as Bede tells us), the future archbishop, ‘the dark and swarthy Italian,’ ‘higher by head and shoulders than his companions’ (as tradition represents him), entered with chanted litany, and uplifted cross, and bannered picture of the Saviour, the walls of Canterbury. Let us pass to the measures by which he sought to plant and to consolidate his mission. It is one of the earliest missions of which we have any details, and one also of the earliest of those in which the teacher stood upon a distinct elevation above the taught, in temporal civilization as well as spiritual knowledge. It is one, therefore, singularly parallel to most of our missions of the present day.

1. We are first struck by the fact, that, unlike the Churches of the old Roman world, the Saxons were converted; not from below upwards, and gradually, but by a wholly reverse process, Princes and nobles accepted the Gospel, and the mass of the people followed *per saltum*, ready to return to their unextirpated heathenism, should a counterchange of feeling come too soon in their rulers. The British and Scotch missions afford, to a certain extent, a contrast to this feature of the Anglo-Italian. They sought to leaven the mass, as well as to convert the chiefs. The cathedral cities of Canterbury and of Dorchester first, and then Winchester, mark a line of preaching as noteworthy in this respect, as is the opposite line indicated by the retired island of Lindisfarne, or by the chapels in the out-of-the-way corners of Essex established by Cedd, or by the little Norfolk village, where stood the cathedral (if he had one) of Bishop Felix. And Paulinus’ teaching in the train of King Eadwin stands in like contrast with that of the itinerant Scotch teachers of Northumbria, and (it must be added) with that also of the Kentish deacon James in the same province. In truth, the Italian and British missionaries were not unlike University men and Dissenters, respectively set to preach to a flock akin educationally and socially to the latter; and the former were not the men to turn their superior refinement into a weapon of power, instead of a cumbrous and repellent armour. We may trace in the results, as on the one hand an account of the early wealth and temporal rank of the Saxon Church and its consequent nationality, so on the other some explanation also of the singular fact of the collapse, after a burst of prosperity, of every Canterbury mission without exception.

2. A ready use of the civil power to promote religion by outward means, is another analogous feature of Augustine’s proceedings and those of his company. Not only did Ethelbert engraft the Church at once into the protection of the State, assigning it a very high numerical value in the scale of protective

penalties which formed the substance of the Saxon code,¹ but before half a century had passed idolatry was prohibited, and Lent enforced, in Kent, under penalties. Augustine, it is true, induced Ethelbert to refrain from compulsion. He simply accepted rank and wealth for the Church. It was left to the last Italian primate so to blend Church and State as to make disobedience to Church discipline a punishable crime in Saxon England. Undoubtedly, to have done otherwise would have been to anticipate the growth of thought by many centuries. And the measures desirable for an uncivilized people are not to be judged by the standard of one in a totally different social and intellectual condition. And the principal, though unthought of, result, in subsequent years, of a Church so thoroughly blended with the State, was independence of the Popedom. In no place more than in Saxon England were the clergy,—gentry by their very office,—so little of a clerical caste, so entirely governed by national laws, so blended with all ranks of society including the highest, so little marked (for a time) by the habitual wearing of a peculiar dress, and so tempted to play the layman; so combined in all functions, legislative and judicial, with the civil magistrate; so thoroughly subject to the national courts. Nowhere, save for a while in Carovingian France, do we find so complete and express a realization of a kingdom modelled after the Jewish in its main politico-ecclesiastical features, as in that system which culminated in Alfred's code of laws. But the fact remains, as characteristic of Augustine that, with the larger views of Gregory, which we may read in the archbishop's instructions to Ethelbert, there was combined a willingness to adopt more immediate and worldly measures, which speedily grew into the extremest theory of a compulsory establishment. That much may be said on both sides is very true. We do not discuss the question, but only note the fact.

3. Dr. Hook has justly noticed a third and kindred feature in the case:—the undue propensity to rest their preaching upon providential interferences which marked the Kentish missionaries. The rain-making, by which Dr. Livingstone was so hardly pressed in Africa, would have been a test which, unlike Dr. Livingstone, we feel persuaded that Augustine would have at least tried to accept. And although the Italians had neither the physical science nor the white man's gun to dazzle or bribe

¹ The certainly not profound question touching theft from Churches, put solemnly by Augustine to Gregory, which excites not unnaturally a passing smile from Dr. Hook, is slightly relieved of its apparent simplicity, if viewed in connection with the laws passed by Ethelbert on the identical subject. The Pope's authority may have appeared desirable for the benefit of the Witenagemot, which, for the first time in Saxon history, was about to 'establish' the Church.

their converts, had they been so disposed, by the privileges of improved health and comfort or superior power, yet they were too much inclined both to interpret the vicissitudes of worldly fortune into immediate and direct declarations from heaven; and to encourage in others, if they did not in their own hearts entertain, a belief in miraculous powers accorded to themselves. The former is, obviously, a double-edged, and so a dangerous argument, as events must soon have rendered it in the present case. With respect to the latter, a distinction must be taken between miracles alleged to have been wrought in the presence of opponents for evidential purposes and to try a direct issue, and those which in an uncritical and ignorant age or place, prepared to expect and to recognise them, cluster round the memory of holy men or holy places, or are attached to periods and crises of religious excitement. The second class (even omitting all obviously legendary stories) come almost exclusively within the sweep of Sir James Mackintosh's destructive canon, quoted by Dr. Hook. They are, in themselves, commonly on that borderland between imagination and fact where it is often impossible even now to determine the point at which the natural ends and the supernatural begins. And the evidence on which they rest is that of credulous or excited minds, incapable, without any imputation upon their honesty, of trustworthy testimony upon the subject. The miracle, then, has still to be proved to be such before we can be called upon to account for it as a miracle. The first class stand upon a different footing, and are incapable of any similar explanation. If the evidence is good, these must, of necessity, be either real miracles or conscious impostures. And if, with Dr. Hook, we believe, *a priori*, that they cannot be the former, and are, with him, unwilling to allow the latter alternative, we must be driven, as a last resource, to follow him in explaining away the evidence on which they rest. Now, in the present case, the miracles indefinitely ascribed to Augustine in Gregory's letter to him, all details of which are mere legend, belong to the second of the two classes above mentioned. And, in the words of Dr. Hook, 'when the enthusiasm' of a 'mass of men, women, and children approaches the very verge of sanity, extraordinary things will occur, which will become more extraordinary still in the narration.' The parallels of not the Jansenists only, or the first Wesleyans, or the Irish revivals, but of every religious fanaticism of all times and places, amply account for the supposition of miracles, without any imputation upon what Dr. Hook loosely calls men's 'general honesty.' But three cases remain, relating respectively to S. Augustine, to Laurentius, and to Paulinus, which are susceptible of no

such middle course. For the conviction respectively of the Britons, of King Eadbald, and of the Northumbrian Eadwin, the restoration of sight to a blind man, a supernatural vision leaving behind very visible material results, and the communication of supernatural information, are distinctly attested by Bede to have occurred. And no one doubts Bede's honesty, as reporting what he himself believed. We confess to inclining in all three instances (though doubtfully) to the hypothesis of pious fraud. That a 'completed Bible' precludes later miracles (which is Dr. Hook's position), appears indeed, to us, a precarious assumption. It limits the purpose of miracles solely to the evidential attestation, and that once for all, of revealed truth. And the withholding of such power from all missionaries at the present day, when combined with the fact that it was possessed by the preachers of the Gospel in primitive times, leaves us still in search of a principle by which to draw the line where such power practically ceased. At the same time, while fully believing that no necessary and absolute moral reason precludes miracles to this day, it is simply impossible to accept the marvellous interpretation of the scourging of Laurentius, or even of the sign by which Augustine sought and failed to compel submission to an unjust claim. And when it is considered further, that the feeling of the age would not have strongly condemned the employment of ingenuity to secure a (supposed) good end, and that at all times the sense of the obligation of openness diminishes towards persons distinctly our inferiors in understanding and culture; so that many people would even now defend the principle of 'economizing' truth towards children; the moral unlikelihood of what we should now rightly condemn as a fraud, becomes materially lessened, even in the case of men otherwise religious and honest. We doubt if the average moral sense of Englishmen would condemn even now those tricks of civilized men upon savages, which Dr. Hook enumerates, assuming that they were played, not out of cruelty, but for a good purpose, as for self-defence, or for the ultimate good of the savages themselves. Add further the ill-drawn line at that day between the natural and the miraculous; the belief on Augustine's part that some kind of miraculous power attached to himself (compare the touching for the king's evil); the strong temptation, both in the easiness and apparent harmlessness of the deceit, and in the emergency of the crisis, which pressed upon the other two; and the greatly diminished improbability of the proceeding on Augustine's part, if it be plain that a like deceit was undoubtedly practised by two of his leading brother-missionaries. And however it may affect our estimate of his character or theirs, the supposition of some sort of half-conscious collusion appears a more likely solu-

tion of the case, than that three stories of a like kind should have grown up within so short a space of time, even in the gossip of a monastery of that age. Dr. Hook, it should be noticed, gets rid of the miracle though not of the deceit in the case of Paulinus by framing his narrative, not upon Bede, but upon his own interpretation of Bede. That the mysterious stranger whose long past words and acts in the distant East Anglian scene of Eadwin's exile, Paulinus knew by revelation, was no other than Paulinus himself, who had been invited to Redwald's court, is Dr. Hook's own assumption, possibly the probable one, yet hardly more so than Neander's hypothesis of an accidental discovery of the story on the part of Paulinus, but by no means admitted or even hinted either by Bede or by Paulinus himself. In this case, as in that of Laurentius, the assumption of the supernatural interference is the turning point of the whole narrative; although we readily admit Dr. Hook's ingenious remark, that, in the history of the British Conference, the whole course of events would run more coherently were the miracle omitted altogether.

4. Concession to heathen practices and prejudices is another marked feature of the Canterbury mission; concession in respect to degrees of marriage, and to the retention of the heathen temples as places of Christian worship, and of the wakes and feasts attached to them: in both cases (though in the latter of the two an afterthought) proceeding from special directions of Gregory himself, and the former being really a concession rendered necessary by the undue strictness of the Papal law. Of accommodation in the actual teaching of the truth itself, either as to the order of the several portions of doctrine to be brought forward, or as to the adapting them to the views of the heathen themselves, we notice no trace. The Chinese Jesuit practices find no precedent in this first of purely Papal missions. Augustine's own teaching, as represented by subsequent tradition, put forward at once, and simply, the distinctive doctrines of the Gospel; a circumstance the more noteworthy when compared with the gradual transition recommended long afterwards by Alcuin (quoted by Dr. Hook) from the lowest foundations of so-called natural religion, by successive steps, to a final teaching of gospel mysteries; and still more when contrasted with the earlier and remarkable letter of Bishop Daniel to the martyr Boniface, laying down for his guidance a distinctive line of argument, by which the heathen superstitions were to be first exhibited in their irrationality, and (it must be added) in the temporal disadvantages which they were represented as bringing upon those who held them, and Christian truths were then to be insinuated by the way into minds convinced of the inadequacy

of their former belief. Augustine seems, to us, in both contrasts, to claim at least the merit of greater simplicity.

The liberality, however, of the concessions which he did make is due to Pope Gregory, not to Augustine. One of these Dr. Hook mentions, though very briefly; the other he has partially misunderstood.

Two classes of questions presented themselves respecting marriage: where was the line to be drawn with respect to affinity and to consanguinity? and in case of marriages contracted before conversion against the law thus enacted, what was to be done if the parties to them became Christians? We commend to the clergy of the diocese of Natal a consideration of the rule laid down upon the latter question. It appears to have been intended to extend to all the classes of marriage specified; although it must be admitted that the words of Gregory strictly taken bind it to that with a brother's widow, and that Eadbald's marriage with his stepmother, although contracted before his baptism, was annulled altogether. Such persons were to be exhorted to live separate, but even in case of refusal were not to be rejected from either baptism or the Lord's Supper; the marriage being plainly held to be in their case valid. As marriages of the kind were prohibited, and were to be held invalid if contracted by Christians, Gregory of course anticipated that the case would be a temporary one which would die out as conversions proceeded. The already over-drawn system of prohibitions and dispensations in the Western Church rendered the other part of the subject far more intricate. Degrees prohibited in Scripture invalidate a marriage. Degrees prohibited only by ecclesiastical law admit of a dispensation. In the former, the Pope refused to concede to heathen laxity at all. Marriage with a stepmother on the father's death, which was a duty among the Teutonic race, was the chief practical difficulty. Gregory expressly forbids it, although at the risk of that which actually occurred, namely, the downfall (for a moment) of the entire mission on the accession of Eadbald. And that king on his baptism was made even to put away his wife, whom he had married, it is true, knowing the Christian prohibition. Marriage with cousins-german is likewise prohibited, with an effort to place the prohibition on Scriptural grounds; and marriage with a brother's widow, for a like reason; both also common among the English of that time. But Dr. Hook has missed the sense of that further rule, which Gregory regarded as a concession, to be retracted as soon as possible. Kinsmen immediately beyond the degree of first cousin—marriage with whom was thought by none to be against Scripture—were to be permitted to marry '*licenter*,' i.e., not '*lawfully*,' as Dr. Hook renders it, but '*by*

a dispensation.' Gregory's own letter to Felix, if it be genuine, and certainly the subsequent commentary of the Penitentials, and the repeated enactments of the later Saxon kings, show that, as a permanent rule, the Pope intended to prohibit, not to permit, marriage in the third and fourth degrees (reckoning according to the Papal reckoning in such matters, and calling cousins-german the second). The former of the two (between second cousins) is pronounced invalid altogether, and the latter is prohibited, but (apparently), if contracted, not dissolved, by Theodore and by Egbert of York. And the civil laws fix the limit of permissible marriage at the sixth degree, which in their reckoning is equivalent to that of the Penitentials. It is candid to add, with a view, not to Dr. Hook, but to the unhappy marriage questions of the day, that although repeated mention occurs in Anglo-Saxon canons of the prohibition to a woman to marry two brothers successively, the converse case, of a man marrying two sisters, is not in terms mentioned. At the same time the laws of Ethelred and Canute show, that the words of Gregory and the subsequent ecclesiastical prohibitions included the latter case under the former.

Architectural reasons, it is to be supposed, prevented any general compliance with Gregory's advice respecting the temples. The church of S. Pancras, at Canterbury, is the one recorded instance of compliance with it. And the zeal of the converted priest himself in Northumbria caused the utter destruction of the northern shrine at Godmundingham. The retention of the wakes conduced, it is to be feared, to the persistence of the abundant popular heathenism to which Saxon canons bear witness, almost as long as there was a Saxon Church. As a practical question, similar topics must arise in our own heathen missions. We commend to them the warning which S. Gregory's well-meant license and its consequences convey.

5. Both these points of large-mindedness, however, wise or unwise, are due to Gregory, not to Augustine. The timid narrowness of the latter shows itself, again, in his uneasiness respecting the variations in the Liturgy, which, probably enough (as Dr. Hook says), his French journey had brought home to him. And this is the more marked, through contrast with Gregory's noble injunction, in reply, to take of the best, no matter whence, for the unencumbered field of the new Church. At the same time, the facts do not bear out the full extent of Dr. Hook's condemnation. It may have been, indeed, that poor Bishop Liudhard's ministrations excited the Italian's jealousy. He made, certainly, little use of the Gallic bishop, although suffering him to minister at Canterbury apparently until his death. But Dr. Hook leaves an erroneous impression in leading

us to suppose him jealous of the Gallic Liturgy. We refer to Mr. Philip Freeman's better informed pages¹ for evidence, that what, in compliance with Gregory's injunctions, he really did, was to adopt into English use the Communion Office of the Roman, with some changes, and the ordinary Offices of the Southern French Churches, these latter having been framed by Cassian on an Oriental model. We learn further, from Mr. Maskell, a still more curious fact—that in the Saxon, not Liturgy indeed, but Pontifical, are preserved rites actually drawn from the British. That Augustine introduced them there can hardly have been the case. We suppose, rather, that they found their way into Egbert's York Pontifical in the first instance; although they occur, we learn, in one that belonged to S. Dunstan also, and were even transported across the Straits to Northern France. One of these we cannot but mention. It is pleasant to think that in the significant delivery of the Gospels to the newly-ordained deacon, we of the English Church are, to this day, preserving a custom handed down from the earliest Church of this island—from the Church that wrested her from idolatry in the days of imperial Rome—a custom which stood the shock of Saxon invasion, and the liturgical changes of the Middle Ages, to symbolize, in brighter times, the one Church which retains an open and accessible Bible.

6. But if with poor Liudhard, yet with others Augustine was not able to fraternize. There were churchmen in his path who followed not with him, or with Rome. A few years later, on the other side of the channel, the identical dispute about Scotch and Roman customs arose, and came to a head in the Council of Matiscon. But there the missionary success and lofty piety of the Scotch monks, stretching their pious labours continuously round the whole east and north of France, from the Swiss Rhine to the promontories of Britany, compelled respectful treatment. Eligius' conduct towards the Scotch abbot of Luxeuil stands in creditable contrast with that of Augustine towards the British. And the charitable dealing on both sides of the controversy ended in the gradual and peaceful absorption of obnoxious or singular customs. A plate in Mabillon gives us both Latin and Celtic tonsures, as worn respectively in the middle of the seventh century, by two loving coadjutors in the missionary work of the north-east of France at that time. That it

¹ We are sorry to see Dr. Hook endorse, with no small amount of inaccuracies, the strangely shallow blunder of the Orientalism of the *British Churches*. The real importation of Orientalism was through the Saxon Church, borrowing, through Augustine, an Orientalized Service-book from Cassian, and adding a few, though very few, additional Orientalisms, through Theodore. Mr. Freeman, however, himself gives in to a trifling error in adopting the supposition that Augustine remained two years at Arles when he went thither to be consecrated.

was otherwise ultimately in Britain itself, arose, first of all, from the pride of Augustine. And once arisen, the schism possibly was best put down within Britain by measures such as were dictated by the fiery zeal of Wilfrid, and finally executed by the iron will of Theodore.

For be it observed, that the British Church was not in opposition to the Roman, or to any other Church, before Augustine made it so. It had simply been severed by distance and by a broad barrier of heathenism from any practical communication with other Churches, and had developed accordingly after its own unaided powers. The case was as of two relatives, who came together after a long parting, and discovered that, during their separation, one of them had contracted certain peculiar views, and retained certain errors formerly common to both, uncorrected,¹ but in no point of any serious importance. And Gregory accordingly did not intend to ignore the remnant of the British Church. On the contrary, he made especial provision for its permanence, by seeking to re-establish only those two archiepiscopates, with their suffragan sees, which would represent the already heathenized parts of Britain. London and York left Caerleon to remain as it was. And the power which he professed to give to Augustine over the suffragan of Caerleon was (we agree with Dr. Hook) simply the power of metropolitan or archbishop, which had possibly rested with the see of London in British times. What, then, the Britons refused,² was,

¹ The British Easter, for instance, was simply identical with what had been the Roman Easter some century and a half before. But the Britons stuck to the Old Style, after science had devised in more astronomical regions a newer and better one; and then behaved about it, much as the old couple who persisted a century since in going to church on Good Friday, Old Style, to find of course no service.

² Taking as guides (1) the borders of the Hwiccas and of Wessex in later times (Bede's one mark of the locality), i.e. the southern border of Gloucestershire, and (2) the Roman roads which intersected it, either by Cirencester, to reach Gloucester, or by Bristol, to pass by Aust and across the Passage to Caerleon, and (3) the fact that at the time of Augustine's visit Saxon power reached in the south-west solely along the southern bank of the Thames, westward to Wilts, and then by a narrow strip, thrust between Gloucester and still British Somersetshire, to the Severn, the whole centre of England being still British, it seems plain that the Welsh tradition (Iolo MSS.), which places Augustine's oak in the Forest of Dean opposite Aust, is almost certainly correct. Ethelbert's power could not have brought Augustine in contact with Britons anywhere else so near to Caerleon. Aust, no doubt, may be *Trajectus Augusti*; so that no stress can be laid upon the name. As to the seven Bishops, about whom Dr. Hook is all astray, there is a Welsh list in the same MSS. (upon which we lay no stress, except from internal probability), which gives the Welsh Bishops (as we should now call them), but according to their then sees, together with a chorepiscopus or two from the immediate neighbourhood, and the still Welsh Bishop of Hereford:—scil. Llanelwy, Llandaff, Llanbadarn, Bangor, Weeg, Morganwg; headed by Hereford, and omitting S. David's. S. David himself died 601, according to the Ann. Cambriæ. The lists in Spelman and Ussher are lists of alleged suffragans of S. David's belonging to the twelfth century, when Giraldus was doing gallant battle for Wales against Canterbury; and have as much to do with Augustine's opponents as Bishop Thirwall and his brethren have.

not Gregory as Pope, but (as Bede expressly says) Augustine for Archbishop. And it was the temper shown by Augustine which moved them to decline what certainly would have been in time the natural arrangement, as it is this day, but what, as the representative of invaders, barely established in the land, and still almost wholly heathens, he had as certainly no right to demand. That the insecure occupant of a petty mission should step at once into the position of even the British Archbishop of London or York, both by the way not impossibly surviving in their own proper persons, at the very time that Gregory was filling their sees with Roman monks;—or, again, that the missionary bishop of an invading tribe, whose permanent possession of the island must have been far from being a recognised fact in the minds of the British, and whose fellow-countrymen, close to the very time, were ravaging and destroying the British soil on both sides of the river where the conference was held, should claim submission to his primacy from British bishops;—were neither of them very self-evident conclusions either from Church law or from common sense. The Britons might well think that a turn of fortune might speedily bring a British monarch back to London itself. Welsh princes claimed the throne of the entire island for a century after Augustine's conference; and once were not far from possessing it. Why should the Church surrender hopes which the State still maintained? Even co-operation in preaching to the heathen was almost impossible, so long as border-war was raging between the peoples; while British missionaries did preach the Gospel even to Saxons, so soon as it could be done. And when we consider the charitable disentanglement of the same controversy by an opposite tone and opposite measures, on the other side of the channel, we cannot but hold Augustine personally answerable for the angry feeling that embittered the Cornish and Welsh Britons in their relation to the Saxon Church. At the same time, party feeling must be strong, and ignorance great, for persons then to invent, and writers now (not, assuredly, Dr. Hook) to repeat, the preposterous libel which converts a hasty speech into a deliberate prophecy, and imagines that any words of the Christian priest either were able, or were needed, to influence the wild Northumbrian pagan, some dozen years after, to shed the blood of Welshmen and monks at the slaughter of Bangor.

An estimate of the true value of Augustine's mission would, we think, seriously alter the view commonly entertained of it. We have tried faintly to suggest some reasons why its direct results should have been so small, but of the fact that they were so there can be no question. The first-fruits of Saxon Christianity were undoubtedly due to him, but they were first-fruits very

slightly connected with the subsequent harvest. The technical transmission of our apostolical succession may be through Augustine. The living stream of Gospel truth mainly passed to us through British channels. Even the 10,000 converts of the report that reached Gregory seem to us to clash with any reasonable idea of the then probable population of Kent. But of one thing there can be no doubt—that had it not been for British missionaries, and for the independent mission of Birinus, there would not have been one Christian Saxon fifty years after the mission was planted outside the boundaries of the Kentish kingdom. The apostle of the English is as much entitled to his fame as Amerigo Vespucci is to the discovery of America. The proportion of Jute, Saxon, and Angle, represents pretty accurately the respective dimensions, in the result, of the Canterbury mission, of that of Birinus, restored by the Scotch-taught but Romanizing Frank Agilbert, and of the purely Scotch and British missions. Every Christian man north of the Thames (with the most petty exceptions) owed his restoration to, and confirmation in, the faith—and except those of the eastern shires, from York¹ downwards, his conversion also—to teachers directly or indirectly Scotch. Every one from Sussex westwards south of the same river Thames, traced his Christianity to labours set on foot by a single Italian, but not from Canterbury, and mainly prosecuted by a Frank and by a Northumbrian. The record of the sixty years' labours of the entire Italian Kentish mission is summed up, after the Kentish success, in three failures to extend their limits—in Middlesex, York, and East Anglia,—in the permission accorded to one of another race and Church to make a more successful effort in the last named of the three, and in a simple abstinence from any effort at all to convert the little county of Sussex, which remained pagan at their very doors after the last Italian prelate had been laid in S. Augustine's porch. If Augustine then is to be the Hengist of the Christian Conquest, his merits must be reduced to the proportions assigned by later philosophical historians to his secular prototype; and the Christianizing, as the Teutonizing, of the island beyond the narrow limits of Kent must be awarded to others.

But the indirect results of the Italian mission were of very different proportions. Had it not been for the link thus riveted between Canterbury and Rome, the Celtic Church of this island itself would speedily have swept back with a returning wave over the country which, as it was, had been wrested from it,

¹ A British missionary baptized Eadwin, according to Nennius; and certainly it is not improbable that Britons co-operated with the mission of Paulinus at the court of one who, according to probable tradition, had spent his boyhood in exile in a Christian Welsh court.

only for a few years by the heathen Saxons, and which in the main it actually did reconquer; and would have severed the whole land effectually from southern or from continental influences. But the ineffective Canterbury prelates of the first mission were as a door that opened a way for a spirit far more potent than their own. And in the result, the Saxon Church became both the pioneer and the most friendly admirer of the Popes in Northern Europe. Had it not been for her, the Christian world might well have seen, in the seventh century, a combination of Churches, of which the British islands would have been the nucleus, and its advanced posts stretching from Iceland at one extreme, to Columbanus' convent of Bobbio on the Lombard plains at the other, with almost everything that can constitute a distinct and vigorous school of religion,—learning, devotion; missionary zeal, and extraordinary missionary aptitude,—all flowing in home-made channels, and marked off by the not unimportant badges of a peculiar clerical habit; and a special fashion of ecclesiastical plain-song, and of ritual, and of liturgy, and by its own calendar of festivals—as widely spread and far better united than the Rome itself of that day, untorn by dissensions, unassailed by Arian barbarians, and as independent of Rome as the patriarchates of Antioch or Alexandria. One element of permanence, as regards a lasting antagonism, was indeed lacking. There was no distinctive principle in any way touching upon the affections or reaching the soul, upon which this independence rested; while in the main question at issue—that of Easter—the British were undoubtedly mistaken. And under such circumstances contact and intercourse must sooner or later have absorbed the Celtic communion into that of Rome,—the less refined, and less centred, and less historically great,—into that which was all these things in a singular degree. It was the work of the Saxon Church, under the influences arising out of the Canterbury mission, to accelerate that absorption. That which Augustine unintentionally began, Theodore and Boniface designedly completed. And the mission of Augustine, in itself an abortive beginning, which, in the presence of a far more Missionary Church, waned for a while and was anticipated in its proper task of converting the British islands to Christianity, succeeded at any rate in keeping the way open to unite them to Rome.

II. From the nominal let us pass to the real founder of the English Church: from the pious though not large-minded missionary, whose labours scarcely took root, to the practical administrator, the lines of whose building in the Church of our land underlie its foundations, and remain in substance unchanged to this very day—from Augustine the Italian to Theodore the Greek.

To secure the victory which the genius of Wilfrid had already gained over the Celtic communion, and to reap the harvest which that communion had chiefly sown, by consolidating the Churches which they mainly and not his own friends had established, out of isolated mission stations (in Dr. Hook's words) into a settled and organized whole,—such was Theodore's work. It was a work that required administrative talent rather than genius, a resolute and practical will rather than a brilliant or profound character, a statesman more than a theologian. The 'Philosopher,'—such was his nickname—at the age of sixty-six, chosen apparently in pure honesty by the Pope,¹ yet to some extent because he could find no one else for the task, and with some distrust of his supposed Greek peculiarities, proved nevertheless, by success, the providence that had guided the choice.

1. Of Theodore's treading out of the Celtic spirit, Dr. Hook says but little, and that little is not wholly correct. His remark is indeed a just one, and to the deserved credit of the Scottish missionaries—that they had made their Saxon converts Christians and not partizans. And when we remember further, that there was no principle or article of faith involved in the question, and that changes in a Latin ritual, and in the rule for determining Easter, were matters touching the clergy almost exclusively, and which once done would be hardly felt by laymen, we shall understand, on the one hand, how the retirement of the persistent part of the Scottish clergy (already brought about by Wilfrid at Whitby) could so effectually uncelticize the Saxon Churches, and, on the other, the wisdom, though hardly the justice, of Theodore's measures for preserving the ground thus won. He simply declared Scotch or British orders invalid, not altogether (as Dr. Hook implies), but until confirmed by a Catholic Bishop—a provision actually renewed, and therefore we suppose held to be required, at so late a period as 816, by Archbishop Wulfred, after the Celtic Churches had conformed to the Roman Easter, but which, one would have thought, even in Theodore's time, must have operated chiefly to keep out men who had already fled. One, however, not wholly but in part of the obnoxious class, remained, but one who had conformed in the matters disputed. But Theodore endured not even the shadow of an exception to his rule. As two of Chad's three

¹ We cannot quite agree with Dr. Hook, that the two Saxon kings *did* leave the choice to the Pope. They asked him to consecrate Wigheard. He, upon Wigheard's death, chose some one else, and consecrated him. This, if Bede's account is complete, they had certainly not asked him to do; although, under the circumstances, it was natural enough that he should do it: and he seems to have bestowed the by no means coveted piece of preferment (or banishment) honestly. That he chose a Greek to conciliate the Oriental Church of Britain is a fancy which falls to the ground with the crotchet on which it is founded.

consecrators were British bishops, and, therefore (by Dr. Hook's leave), *not* in communion with Canterbury, whatever Bishop Wini might have thought of them, Theodore enforced compliance with the strictest (indeed, an over strict) interpretation of his own rule, by refusing to recognise Chad's episcopal (not, as Dr. Hook conjectures, priestly) orders, until he had himself confirmed them. A still more arbitrary enactment placed Scotch and British baptism in the category of baptisms of uncertain validity, and commanded conditional rebaptism. Another provision, in a different place, deposes priests who do not baptize by trine immersion. And the practice of single immersion, found at Dol in Britany so late as 1620, lends probability to Kunstmann's conjecture that we have here the defect in baptism imputed by Augustine to the British—a conjecture deriving some support from the dropping of the objection by Augustine, inasmuch as Gregory, at the very time, in a letter to Spanish bishops, ruled the point to be indifferent.¹ Theodore, then, may have seized upon this ground, to widen the difference, opinion in the European Churches gradually tending towards making trine immersion necessary. He may have sought in it something like a doctrinal ground to justify his arbitrary assumption of a formal schism. At the same time, he does not venture to stigmatize the Celtic Churches as heretical. For heretical baptism and heretical orders, in the teeth of canons and councils, he pronounces invalid altogether. But whatever his reason, the measure shows at once the character of the man—resolute, uncompromising, and harsh, determined to enforce uniformity, yet striking heavily only where he was sure of his blow, and was safe from a recoil.

2. His administration of the English Church thus Saxonized is marked by equal foresightedness, and by a like determination, but by greater management, and by measures of a nobler and more Christian cast. The pastoral system, thoroughly supervised by bishops, with sees of manageable dimensions, and worked by an educated clergy, and the whole regulated by an annual synod,—such were the four points on which, helped perhaps by Eastern experience, his whole work was concentrated. It is significant of his wisdom, and little creditable to ourselves, that the effectual working of these very points, as adapted to our altered circumstances, should be precisely what the same English Church, after almost 1,200 years, is at length piecemeal wresting for herself from a reluctant and irreligious public opinion. It

¹ The canon respecting baptism, alleged by S. Boniface to have existed in the English Church since the time of Augustine, and declaring the naming *all* the Persons of the Holy Trinity necessary to a valid baptism, looks the same way.—S. Bonif. Epist. 82, ad Zach. Papam.

is true that some doubt may be made whether Theodore organized the parish system, or, at any rate, to what extent he succeeded in establishing it. Elmham, the one direct authority for the statement, may perhaps have interpreted *parochia* into parish, when it really meant diocese. And there are proofs of itinerant missions in the North still existing half a century later. Nor could such a system, established as his was by the efforts of private persons, be established, in the nature of the case, otherwise than gradually. But the whole system of the Penitential, and the undoubted growth of parishes in the modern sense in the eighth century, show plainly that the idea of the parish underlay his plans, and that he at least originated the movement which, in course of time, has developed into our present network of village churches, each with its appointed priest, in settled pastoral relations to a definite flock.

Dr. Hook's account of the division of sees, Theodore's first great work, is singularly jejune and hasty. Yet there is much that is curious and instructive, and a good deal of intricate history in the matter. Unhappily, bishops were to be found even then to oppose a perverse obstinacy to a measure, resting, it should seem, on the first principles of religion and of common sense. The same grounds which afterwards induced both the chief English States, and the European States generally, to struggle for a special and single metropolitan apiece, appear, in the present instance, to have led them to struggle for a single bishop, and thus to have thrown political influence commonly against Theodore. And conquest and reconquest again shifted sees by a more summary process still, as in the cases of Stow or Sidnaceaster, Whitherne, and possibly Dorchester. But the chief opposition, sad to say, arose from the bishops themselves. The wealth and dignity attached to the single see of an entire state, appears to have been commonly the unworthy motive to that opposition. A see that stretched from the Humber to the Forth, or southward from the Humber to the Thames, presented a territorial grandeur of idea, and a more solid amount of episcopal lands, which the holders could not bring themselves to relinquish; although a bishop only of the Graham type could administer them, and even Bishops Tait and Waldegrave would, we hope, have shrunk from the undertaking. Wessex, from the very beginning, anticipated Theodore's measures by a 'synodica sanctio,'—evidently passed in a provincial Witenagemot, and prompted by former attempts at a division of the kind,—which crushed the idea in the bud by assenting to the continued union of the whole kingdom in the hands of the new Bishop Leutharius. And a subsequent decree of Theodore, derived, however, from a questionable source, surrenders

the hope of accomplishing the division under the plea of respect for the individual bishop, at that time Theodore's personal friend, Hæddi. In East Anglia alone, we read of no opposition. In Mercia and Northumbria, the object was accomplished only by the deposition and banishment of the respective bishops. We have not space to detail the very complicated mode of its accomplishment, which is obscured by the contradictions, as well as by the omissions, of the chroniclers. But it ought to be stated—Dr. Hook leaves us in ignorance—that, on the most probable reckoning, modern England, with her at least twenty-fold population, deems sufficient to this day for the portion of the country where Theodore accomplished his purpose, more bishops by precisely two than Theodore himself established.¹ Manchester and Ripon are the literal measure as yet of the tardy increase which the nineteenth century has deemed it necessary to make upon the seventh. It must be noted also that, in Theodore's plan of division, Gregory's original scheme was entirely ignored. All the bishops of the entire Heptarchy, including York, were made subject to the single primacy of Canterbury. Further, that the divisions were made by Kings and Witenagemots, in co-operation with Theodore. And a comparison with Leofric's proceedings in the time of Edward the Confessor, respecting the removal of the see of Crediton to Exeter, will mark forcibly the increased interference of the See of Rome at the latter period, and that, too, a time when Edward gave away bishoprics by charter, much as he would have given his lands. Lastly, that Theodore made no change in the practice which he found in Northumbria (as in Canterbury itself), of monastic chapters and abbot-bishops; although the rule in Mercia appears to have been different, with the exception of Worcester. In all this, as in the gradual method generally of the Archbishop's proceedings, in his politic compromise and reserve (so oddly represented by Dr. Hook) at the Council of

¹ With Wessex Theodore could not interfere. We assume, on the strength of Bede's otherwise incomprehensible *Ætla* of Dorcic, and other probabilities too long to detail, that (as Florence implies) there was an attempt to preserve the See of Dorchester, as well as that of Stow or Sidnacester. And we set Whitherne against Carlisle. There remain, then, the following lists:—

1. Canterbury	= 1. Canterbury.	9. Stow	= 10. Lincoln.
2. Rochester	= 2. Rochester.	10. Hereford	= 11. Hereford.
3. London	= 3. London.	11. Worcester	{ = 12. Worcester.
4. Dunwich	} = 4. Norwich.		{ = 13. Gloucester.
5. Elmham		12. York	= 14. York.
	5. Ely.	13. Ripon	= 15. Ripon.
	6. Peterborough.	14. Hexham	} = 16. Durham.
6. Lichfield	= 7. Lichfield.	15. Lindisfarne	
7. Leicester	= 8. Chester.		17. Manchester.
8. Dorchester	= 9. Oxford.	16. Whitherne	= 18. Carlisle.

Hertford, in his concession to Wessex, in the pertinacity with which, even when helping in 686 to restore Wilfrid, he restored him, not to the York which he had refused to surrender, but to a diocese of the precise limits (save that it still included Ripon), which he had before indignantly declined,—we read at once the skill and the resolution of the practised ruler,—the strong rock against which the passionate vivacity of Wilfrid dashed itself in vain.

The Penitential of Theodore, however, is the chief proof of the solidity and thoroughness of his work. Assuming (what at present we have no means of correcting) that the work as we have it is substantially Theodore's, it proves him to have aimed at establishing throughout the land what we should now call the principle of parishes. A church with its proper presbyter, and with its weekly mass and (as it appears subsequently) sermons, was to be provided for each district, the landowner finding the funds in return for the patronage, or, at any rate, the patronage accruing to him, be the founder who he might. A yearly confession prior to Christmas-day¹ was to bring each layman, with his wife and household, into pastoral relation with his presbyter. And a system of discipline of the minutest kind was to bind together the whole of each flock into an organized member of a well-knit body, each parish under its presbyter, and all combined in direct and practical subordination to the bishop. How much of this Theodore simply borrowed is not quite plain. The Scotch Penitentials may have suggested it in small part: but that of Cummiānus is a mere sketch in comparison with Theodore's; and the *Regula Columbani* is an ascetic code of Christian manners for a monastery, not (as is Theodore's) a directory for a presbyter in the management of a parish, which the presbyter indeed alone was intended to see. His Eastern experience may have been of more direct help; and the spurious Penitential in the Appendix to the Benedictine S. Jerome, is the pattern nearest to the copy. But the parochial element which is assumed as the corner-stone of the whole, is characteristic, as far as we know, of Theodore's; although Dr. Hook has pointed out that Justinian's Code may have suggested even this. He takes care even to provide that, where a monastery exchanges lands, a presbyter shall be supplied to that district, which, by passing out of the hands of the monastery, was no longer supplied with pastoral ministrations by the monastery itself. And confirmation by the bishop in the open air, evidently on the

¹ See Egbert's Dialogue, Thorpe, ii. 96. Possibly, they might choose their own confessors at this season. At any rate, the words are 'ad suos confessores.' A comparison of Egbert's rules with Theodore's will show that the parochial system had become much more complete at the later date.

ground of the smallness of the church, is spoken of as permissible only in case of necessity, the existence of churches everywhere being plainly assumed. Throughout, the principle underlies the whole scheme, that each member of the Christian Church in England shall be placed in a pastoral relation to a special presbyter attached to a particular Church. What was to be the nature of that relation must be judged, in Theodore's case, by the divinity of the time. At any rate, confession to God is expressly declared by Theodore himself to be sufficient. And confession to a priest is for the purpose of learning at the spiritual physician's hands the measures of a truer and more solid repentance. The wisdom, again, of these measures themselves must be judged in the abstract no doubt by the results, but in regard to Theodore himself (as Dr. Hook truly and candidly says), by the point of view in which the subject would have presented itself prior to the making of the experiment at all. The strange literalness with which, not in this work only, but in many other ways, divines of that age used the Old Testament—(e. g. the so called Penitential of Theodore not only begins in the *MS.* with the Ten Commandments [after the Augustinian reckoning, the second merged in the first], but the prohibitions about usury, and much of those about clean and unclean animals, strange to say, are simply borrowed by it, as by Egbert and Boniface afterwards)—the exceeding minuteness with which degrees of sin are distinguished—the enormous severity of the penalties—the speedy introduction of commutations of penance, some of them of the most whimsically mischievous kind (and we have probably Egbert's authority for assigning commutations of some sort to Theodore himself)—the inevitable externalization of morals resulting from such a minute quantitative measure of outward acts—the temptation arising from the mere bulk and duration and extent of the penances to exalt these into ends and not instruments, into meritorious compensations instead of a discipline to lead the soul more truly to the Saviour and Judge Himself,—all this, apart from any particular question of doctrine, may be truly alleged against the system itself. But it may be still made a question—we heartily enter into Dr. Hook's remarks on the subject—whether this real, and grand, and heart-searching, though doubtless mistaken, attempt to build up in the hearts of men the perfecting of holiness in the fear of God, is not at least as good as the substituting for all such attempts the mere weekly listening to a favourite preacher. Theodore, at any rate, must be judged by the antecedents and circumstances of his own time, not by the maturer experience of our own. And for one thing at least we owe to him, under God, unmixed gratitude—that he has established in

this Church of ours, as one of its very foundation-stones, the principle that each individual Christian ought to have his own Church, and to stand in a distinct and recognised relation to his own pastor. For the condition of morals, again, with which he had to deal, he is not to be held answerable. And much that is repulsive in his work arises from the nature of the sins with which he felt it a duty to grapple, as well as from the habit of plain-speaking in an age certainly not delicate. The book, too, expressly limits its own readers to the presbyters whom it was intended to guide. It is doubtful, again, to what extent his system was realized. His penitential rules had no other authority than that which his name would give them. But we know from Egbert's wholesale adoption of them—from the repeated copies of them down to the eleventh century—from the use made of them by later bishops, who modified and added to them until the exact original has been buried under the later variations—from the continued reference to Theodore as the originator of all rules of the kind in England—that their authority in point of fact stood high. Yet the Council of Cloveshoo under Cuthbert condemned a commutation of penance, impudently put forward, yet it must be owned with considerable justification, by a certain rich man, which it would be hard to distinguish from some allowed, or said to be so, by Theodore himself. And, of course, it stands to reason that no system of the kind could ever be enforced without the largest possible amount of practical modification. Yet, on the other hand, the concessions which are made by the book itself must have tended to prolong and to extend its effectiveness by diminishing the difficulties which lay in its path. Lastly, the system of penalties in the Saxon civil laws, justly compared by Dr. Hook, must have smoothed the way for the parallel system in this ecclesiastical code. In point of minute estimate of the outward act of wrong, and of precise apportionment of penalty, the laws of the Saxon kings, and not least those of Alfred himself, far exceed those of the Greek Archbishop. And the people who were accustomed to pay a varying penalty for bodily injuries, according as it were the great toe or the little one, the great tooth or the canine tooth or the grinder, that was injured, would have found nothing strange in the far more widely graduated scale of the rules of Theodore.

His educational schemes may be found briefly described in Dr. Hook's pages. Their success is testified by the results. That which produced directly Aldhelm, indirectly Bede, must have been a school where the devotional discipline and the standard of intellect and of learning stood alike high. But this, though Theodore was its moving spirit, was the direct work of Hadrian. It led, at any rate, to that first and early

glory of S. Augustine's as a training school, which, though with a different aim (like the less significant case of the ecclesiastical position of Lindisfarne), the nineteenth century has seen revived.

The synodical action of the Church was the regulating principle by which it must be supposed that Theodore intended to keep the working of his system true. And here again both political questions and ecclesiastical disputes seem to have interfered from the beginning with the fulfilment of the appointed rule of an annual meeting. At the same time, the probability that no record would be kept of a synod where nothing of importance was done, and the discovery, through the documents published by Kemble, of many synods or meetings of bishops, known only by the accident of their having at the time of the synod attested some petty gift or exchange of lands, renders it quite possible that synods might have been held a good deal more regularly than there is any trace of documents to prove. It is more remarkable, that the first recorded synod of the whole English Church after that of Hertford (673), was held and by Theodore himself, not at Cloveshoo, the appointed place, but at Hatfield (680); and that no synod is known to have been held at Cloveshoo before that of Cuthbert, assigned commonly to 747. On the locality of Cloveshoo itself, unfortunately, we can throw no more light than may be contained in the observation, that S. Boniface invariably styles the English synod, '*Synodus Londinensis*;' and that (inasmuch as in the middle of the eighth century he could hardly have cherished any still lingering idea of the archbishopate of London) the immediate vicinity of that city—in all other respects the most probable of all localities—seems consequently the place where antiquarians must hunt for traces of the lost Cloveshoo.

3. One feature remains to complete this hasty sketch of Theodore's Archiepiscopate—his attitude towards the Popes and towards Wilfrid. On this topic also, Dr. Hook, as usual, is correct in outline but inaccurate in detail. Later scribes tell us, in copies of Theodore's Penitential, that he carefully avoided contradicting the decrees of the Popes. The Penitential itself, even as we have it, shows, on the contrary, that he recorded the customs of Greeks and Romans as of like authority, as precedents to be followed or not according to their intrinsic value, and set aside the latter where it suited him without scruple.¹ A like spirit pervaded his acts.

¹ We may note out of the Penitential, as of present interest, (1) a permission, in case of need, to have but one sponsor, of either sex (this is one of the not many Orientalisms in which we may trace the Greek of Tarsus); (2) a prohibition, on pain of excommunication, of presence at mass without communicating; (3) an inti-

In the one subject of dispute which arose—the attempt to reverse his division of English sees by the authority of the Pope, an attempt which, begun by others, culminated in the case of Wilfrid—Theodore was perfectly willing to explain or to conciliate, but he pursued his original purpose to the end unmoved. An opposition to his measures had been attempted at Rome antecedently to Wilfrid, probably by Winfrid of Lichfield. Of the seemingly three Councils, held at Rome in 680, that have any relation to England, the first had no reference to Wilfrid, and ended in the despatch of a messenger to Theodore with some general instructions about English bishoprics, and a special message relating to the Monothelite controversy; the second discussed the cause of Wilfrid, and passed a decree in his favour; the third, at which the Pope expected Theodore's personal presence, was held in order to transmit a collective declaration of the orthodoxy of the West respecting Monothelitism to the forthcoming Council of Constantinople. Theodore sent explanations by messengers, and held a Council in England to do his part in making up the Western declaration of faith—the one interference of the Saxon Church in Eastern or metaphysical controversy—but refrained from appearing at Rome in person, and simply ignored the Pope's letters in favour of Wilfrid.¹ Five years elapsed, passed by Wilfrid in prison or exile. And then we are told by Wilfrid's enthusiastic biographer that, moved by the approach of death and by the persuasions of friends, the Archbishop yielded. A closer examination shows that his concession was of that kind which simply maintains its own ground. The York which Wilfrid had grasped so tenaciously was a diocese conterminous with the kingdom of Northumbria, extended at the time for a short while over the Humber

mation, not a command, in favour of weekly communion; (4) a prohibition of lay baptism in general, but a provision enforcing it in case there be none but a layman present, and the person to be baptized be at point of death; (5) a prohibition, not only of field labour (sheep-shearing, by the way, was *woman's* work among the Saxons), but of shaving or bathing on the Lord's-day, but with an exception in favour of washing the head and feet; (6) that intentional desertion of a man by his wife for five years leaves the husband free, with the bishop's consent, to marry again: a similar permission being extended, without mentioning the bishop, to both husband and wife, if either were carried into captivity, after five years if nothing were heard of the captive; after seven if it were impossible to redeem him or her; (7) the imposition of three years' penance upon a presbyter, two upon a deacon, one upon a subdeacon, who should be guilty of the iniquity of *hunting*.

¹ That Wilfrid was legate of the English Church or of Theodore, at the third council mentioned above, is merely the assertion of the Roman scribe of the council, assimilating the style of Wilfrid's signature to that of other bishops, who *were* legates of their respective Churches. Eddius, whose evidence is in such a case indisputable, and Bede from him, giving the precise words of Wilfrid's signature, show that he simply testified, as on personal knowledge, being present at the council, and now acquitted, and (by the Pope) restored to the orthodoxy of not only Saxons but also Britons, and Scots, and Picts. He certainly was not the legate of the three last.

into Lincolnshire, and stretching northward to the Forth. The York to which Wilfrid was restored was the York of modern days, prior to the severance from it of Ripon; a see conterminous with the kingdom of Deira only, from which Lincoln had been severed again by the fortunes of war. And the sees of Bernicia, now two in number (omitting Whitherne), remained separate as Theodore had arranged them, and were, upon Wilfrid's restoration, held by him simply *in commendam*, and successively, for one year apiece, upon the deaths of their respective holders, until a successor (*not* Wilfrid) was consecrated to each. The only counter-concession in the case was made by the two occupants of the sees of York (thus limited) and Ripon, Bosa and Eadhæd, who gave way to the restoration of Wilfrid, apparently at the request of Theodore, preferred to the Northumbrian king. Conciliation, not concession, is the proper term for the transaction thus explained—conciliation towards the zealous Wilfrid, fresh from his noble mission to the people of Sussex—conciliation towards the Papal see, which, in decreeing the restoration of Wilfrid, had decreed also that his episcopate should subsequently be divided but to bishops of his own choice.

And now the aged Archbishop might peaceably contemplate his finished work for the short remainder of his life,—troubled, unhappily, by wars and rumours of wars near home, between Kent and Wessex, but able to rejoice in the substantial accomplishment of the Church labours which he had set himself, and in their results,—the last spot of Anglo-Saxon heathendom at length covered by the waters of the Gospel,—the earliest mission of that Church, the streamlet-parent of a mighty flood, shedding its first refreshing drops upon the mother-land of the Saxons across the channel,—the schism of Wilfrid healed for the time, and, as far as Theodore could know, effectually,—and that Church which he had found disorganized, divided, a mere assemblage of 'isolated missions,' now at least on the way to become a complete and organized Church throughout the land, the foundations of which he had, under God, laid so deep and true, as to be still the groundwork, after almost twelve centuries, of the same one Church of England.¹

¹ The stern Theodore had a tender heart, as Dr. Hook truly infers from Eddius's account of his reconciliation with Wilfrid, qualify that partial friend's statement how we may. The half-dozen lines which we subjoin, and which were appended to a 'presentation copy' of his Penitential, sent to Hæddi, Bishop of Wessex, reveal a like characteristic:—

'Te nunc sancte Speculator,
Verbi Dei digne dator,
Hæddi, pie præsul, precor,
Pontificum ditum decor,
Pro me tuo peregrino,
Preces funde Theodoro.'

We must devote a few words, in conclusion, to express our regret at the present condition of the documentary materials of Anglo-Saxon Church history. They are contained mainly in three works. The *Codex Diplomaticus* of Mr. Kemble, devoted all but exclusively to charters, belongs to Church history only as to one of many subjects illustrated by the endless mine of information there collected. Of course, we do not look to such a work for a complete and critical collection of ecclesiastical documents, as such. Of the other two, the ecclesiastical volume of Mr. Thorpe's 'Anglo-Saxon Laws and Institutes,' although the result of great labour and an enormous advance in critical skill and learning upon all its predecessors, and containing a large proportion of valuable matter not before published, is yet open to two objections. We do not understand upon what principle it admits or excludes documents. And whatever be that principle, the result is, that it contains but a portion of those which exist,—if all the Laws, yet only *some* of the Penitentials, and only *some* of the Councils, and nothing besides. And further, while professing to publish (for the first time) the genuine Penitential of Theodore, in addition to that of Egbert, it does, in effect, do neither. The omission, indeed, of that which is supposed to be the most genuine recension (so to call it) of Egbert's work, was, we believe, the result of the unexpected termination of the series of Record publications, and therefore no otherwise Mr. Thorpe's fault than that, of course, the MS. (now still unprinted in the Bodleian Library) should have been used in the editing of the recension which he actually has published. But the fact remains, that we are still without the genuine Egbert, or (to be more correct) without that which is probably the nearest approach to the work as he wrote it. The Penitential of Theodore, so called, we are sorry to say, Mr. Thorpe has only printed *in part* from the Corpus MS. He has omitted, without any real authority in the MS. for so doing, six chapters at the beginning,¹ above a score at the end, and two long passages (quotations) in the middle. And further, although a modern superscription in that MS. calls it Theodore's, and although in substance it no doubt is so, yet, as it stands, we must affirm that it is assuredly not Theodore's. Mr. Thorpe himself took notice that the chapters at which he breaks off could not be Theodore's; and he takes the strange course, in consequence, of cutting off the latter half of what the MS. treats as a single work, instead of drawing the plain inference that the *whole* work was not Theo-

¹ These chapters contain the scriptural basis on which the rules that follow are rested. They are recognised in the rubric at the commencement of the Table of contents; but the headings of the chapters after the first are omitted in that table, which *after the rubric* begins with the first chapter printed by Mr. Thorpe.

dore's but only a recension of his work, or one founded upon it. And even what Mr. Thorpe has published is as plainly not the great Archbishop's, as that which he omits. The very first chapter in his publication bears upon its face the proof that its writer lived after the conversion of Germany and Saxony, and had himself dwelt for some time in those countries. Whether another form of the Penitential can be found approaching more nearly to the original, is another question; but, as in the former case we certainly have not now the best form of the work of Egbert, so neither, in this, have we the best form of that of Theodore. Moreover, although the matter is a very difficult one to accomplish, we do not think that Mr. Thorpe's mode of handling these Penitentials conveys an accurate idea of the state of the case. Every bishop thought himself entitled to interpolate and change the provisions of his Penitential almost at his own pleasure; and we have, therefore, some dozen or more MSS. of Penitentials, differing in arrangement and contents, yet all calling themselves by the names of Theodore, Egbert, or Bede, and all containing much of the same matter or the same words. Mr. Thorpe, in the case of Theodore, has chosen one text—concede for a moment that it is the best—and has thrown the other texts into the shape of various readings in supplementary additions to that one. And this would be well enough, if we had clearly as our groundwork the real book substantially as Theodore or Egbert wrote it, and if the other MSS. agreed in main outline with that chosen as the basis. But neither of these two things is the case. We have merely a set of different recensions (so to call them) by different hands, varying to every possible degree in arrangement and contents. And the point is to place these different recensions before the reader, without reprinting the same matter over and over again; and yet without conveying the idea that all are so nearly the same as to be capable of being represented by various readings upon one. Want of space, no doubt, was Mr. Thorpe's reason for doing as he has done; and we are by no means clear that a better plan is even possible; but at any rate he should have fairly warned us how the matter actually stood. Moreover, there are some foreign MSS. of the so-called Bede's Penitential, which have been printed by Kunstmann since Mr. Thorpe's book was published, and which, therefore, he was of course unable to use.

We turn, then, still to Wilkins's 'Concilia,' as to the only repertory of our native ecclesiastical documents professing to include them all. It need hardly be said to any one who has examined the work, with what utter dissatisfaction an inquirer will turn away from the huge but undigested and inaccurate folios. It was a great work for its time, but in the present state

of both knowledge and criticism it has become contemptible. A writer who prefers the testimony of Matthew of Westminster, or a preposterous fable out of Nennius, to the account of a contemporary biography of the fifth century, who believes in Bale (Dr. Hook, we fear, is still within the shadow of a like darkness), who tumbles into his heap, as of equal value, the contents of a legendary life of the tenth century, and of the '*Liber Landavensis*,' and of the letters of Pope Gregory, and of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, and of the Appendix to Edward the Confessor's Laws (which contains the letter of Eleutherius to Lucius and a marvellous Pambritannic Council under Ina), and of the Magdeburg Centuriators,—a writer, in short, who lived while the delusion still lasted of believing almost alike whatever was found in print or MS., irrespective of dates or other circumstances affecting the witness's credibility,—a writer, again, who is so troubled with oscitancy, that, when printing under their several alleged dates a series of letters, produced in a lump, and under very suspicious circumstances, by Archbishop Lanfranc in 1072, he, by mere inadvertence, omits two of the series altogether, and places the others on the same footing with letters of undoubted genuineness,—a writer, lastly, whom Anglo-Saxon scholars rank indeed among the giants of his time for Anglo-Saxon lore, but add further, and prove by the most ludicrous examples, that his knowledge was quite incapable of saving him from the strangest of blunders in translating an Anglo-Saxon document,—such a writer must certainly have produced a book largely capable of improvement, even with respect to the materials which he actually has accumulated. And when the enormous increase of knowledge and of accessibility of MSS. is taken into account, it is obvious that the amount of materials which have escaped his knowledge must be likewise great. His ideas of arrangement also are singular. Three or four letters picked out of a series at random, and printed in an order not chronological, for the text, and the rest (nor quite all of these) thrust into an appendix,—such is his treatment of Pope Gregory's English letters. A heap of so-called Councils of the diocese of Llandaff, bundled all together at one date (to which possibly two of them belong), because there happen to be no Anglo-Saxon documents of that particular period,—a lump of narrative out of Eddius, undigested and out of its chronological place, from which we are to make out for ourselves the closing events of the great Wilfrid contest,—one, and that the most easily accessible, out of three documents touching the Easter controversy, the letter to King Naitan, printed straight from Bede, while those of Columbanus and (still more inexcusably) Aldhelm are omitted,—such are specimens of the order of the

first half (the Saxon portion) of Wilkins's first volume. Of accuracy of texts we will say nothing. We have confined ourselves to the choice and arrangement of the documents themselves. Certainly, it is not to the credit of our historical or our ecclesiastical literature, that such should be the disorderly, incorrect, incomplete, and undigested condition of the great and standard collection of proofs and illustrations of the history of the English Church.¹

¹ We take the opportunity of referring to the intended publication, not so much of a new edition of Wilkins, as of a work on the basis of his, which is said to be contemplated by the Clarendon Press. It is to be hoped that when it appears it may be worthy of the advanced state of ecclesiastical knowledge, and of its subject, and of the University which fitly undertakes it.

ART. V.—*The Influence of the Septuagint Version of the Old Testament upon the Progress of Christianity.* By the REV. RALPH CHURTON, B.A. Fellow of King's College, Cambridge. Macmillan. 1861.

MR. CHURTON was the successful competitor for the Hulsean Prize Essay in 1859, but it is seldom that a prize essay is of much importance to the public. It is generally creditable to the author, applauded in the Senate House at Cambridge, or the Theatre at Oxford, and then it passes into 'the tomb of all the Capulets,' where all temporary things are forgotten. But we confidently predict a longer existence to Mr. Churton's Essay. It is composed of materials which the public, at least the Church of England, will not willingly 'let slip.' It is written on a subject full of interest, and also full of novelty. We will not speak of it, as the discoveries of Livingstone, '*loca nullius ante trita solo*;' but we believe that it is a region of Church history seldom visited, and little explored. How few of us have seriously contemplated that, for more than 300 years, the entire Christian Church could read the Old Testament only through the spectacles of the LXX. How few of us consider that this Greek Version was the forerunner of Christ and Christianity, by preparing the highway in the desert for the Gentiles! How seldom do we reflect, that it brought up 'the Parthians, and Medes, and Elamites, the dwellers in Mesopotamia, and Cappadocia, in Pontus, and Asia (Pro-consular), Phrygia and Pamphylia, in Egypt and in parts of Libya about Cyrene, the strangers of Rome, the proselytes, Cretes and Arabians,' to be miraculously baptized by the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost, and to constitute the original nucleus of the Christian Church!

But if such were its comprehensive external influence in preparing the world for the advent of Messiah, how much greater and more important, how enduring and everlasting is its subjective influence on the language and doctrines of the New Testament! There is not a single versicle from Matthew to the Apocalypse which does not give evidence to the mint of the Pharos. There is not a doctrinal term which is not taken from its phraseology. What are *πίστις*, *μετάνοια*, *λύτρωσις*, *σωτηρία*, *καταλλαγή*,¹ *ἀγιασμός*, *δικαιοσύνη*, κ.τ.λ., but the doctrinal treasures of the Septuagint?

¹ Perhaps, *καταλλαγή* may be thought an exception, as it does not occur in the LXX. in a doctrinal sense. But whoever will consult 2 Macc. i. 5, vi. 20, vii. 33, viii. 29, will be fully convinced of its doctrinal acceptance by the Hellenists. We have cited it, to evince the great importance of the apocryphal books as an appendix to the Canonical Scriptures.

We rejoice to find a Fellow of King's, an Etonian *alumnus*, forgetting awhile Ciceronian Latin and Greek iambics, to investigate the semi-barbarisms of the Hellenistic dialect, by collating these sympathies of thoughts and language. We had been apprehensive lest Mr. Jowett should have found no rival in Septuagintal erudition. But we are satisfied that the time has come for reinstating the Septuagint in the same rank which it held in the Primitive Church. The days of Spearman and the Hutchinsonians have already passed away. The unnatural attempts of Hebrew critics to depreciate the LXX. are now justly discountenanced. We can now perceive that every blow which is aimed at the Greek Version recoils on the Greek of the New Testament.

Mr. Churton commences his Essay with a masterly sketch of the extent to which the Greek language prevailed in the world at the time of the Christian era. He shows amongst the five great empires, it was that of the Greeks which was chosen by Providence to be chiefly instrumental in introducing that spiritual 'kingdom which shall never be destroyed.' The Babylonian and Persian empires ministered partly to this object in God's great economy; but the work assigned to them seems to be more in close connexion with the Jewish Church; whilst the third and fourth empires are far more important in their relation to the calling of the Gentiles into the Church of Christ. Hence 'it was to the nation out of which the third great empire 'arose, that God assigned the part of providing a universal 'language for extending the intellect of man so as to enable 'him to appreciate the truths of Divine Revelation.'—P. 11.

It was that peculiar dialect of Greek which we term Macedonic or Hellenistic, which was ordained to become the special vehicle for bringing the Gentiles into a knowledge of the promises and prophecies of the Old Testament. This was effected principally by the conquests of Alexander, who personally visited Jerusalem, and whose armies contained a large number of Jewish proselytes. Alexandria was founded to succeed the commercial cities of Tyre and Sidon, whose ports were already injured by progressive accumulations of sand. The Jews formed a considerable part of its population, and they naturally desired that their Scriptures should be translated into their vernacular language. The Ptolemies, to whom Egypt had fallen in the partition of Alexander's conquests, gladly favoured their desires, and assigned chambers in the Pharos for the completion of their labours.

They had MSS. sent from Jerusalem, and they executed their task just as might have been expected. It was Macedonic Greek, conjoined to Hebraic idioms—that wondrous fusion of

Greek and Hebrew which we term Hellenistic, and which forms the characteristic style of the New Testament. We claim no direct inspiration for the Version, further than it is identified with the language of the evangelists and apostles. But no man can read the history of the Septuagint, without believing that the God of Moses and the Prophets assisted their endeavours.

Such was the universal conviction of the Christian Church during the first three centuries. It was not till the days of Jerome that any voice was raised against the canonical authority of the Greek Version. An unhappy controversy then arose between Jerome and Augustine, the echoes of which are still reverberating on our ears. That it was a great blessing to recover in some degree the knowledge of the Hebrew, and to read it in the Latin Vulgate, can never be questioned; but the blessing should have been acknowledged, without any attempt to disparage the Version. Had there been no schism between the Eastern and the Western Church, perhaps, this controversy would have gradually subsided. But it was unfortunately revived at the era of the Reformation, and the school of Geneva has been always distinguished for its depreciation of the LXX.

There are two aspects for viewing the Septuagint. The one by considering it merely as a version; and here it must always hold a secondary rank. The other, by considering it as the mighty instrument for the conversion of the Gentiles, and the authoritative dictionary of the New Testament. Whatever external inferiority it may possess as a Version, is more than compensated by its subjective influence on Christianity. Ask, *e.g.* at the present moment, whether it be the Hebrew or the Greek text which exercises the greater dominion over Christianity? But we forbear contrasts. We only desire peace and harmony—'That which God hath joined together, let no man put asunder.'

It is on this indissoluble alliance of the New Testament with the Septuagint, that Mr. Churton has constructed his admirable Essay.¹ He has ingeniously selected the Constantinopolitan Creed for the vehicle of his doctrinal illustrations, by enabling him to assemble all the leading doctrinal terms of the New Testament in a short compass. He collates these with similar

¹ There is but one point on which we differ from Mr. Churton, and that is on the Septuagintal origin of the Psalms in our English Prayer Book. Whoever turns to the 14th Psalm, will be at once convinced of this fact. Our translators have frequently modified the version to meet the Hebrew text; but they have left indelible traces of its origin. In their Hebrew order of the Psalms, they only followed the ancient Anglo-Saxon version, which gives the same Hebraic order, but which scrupulously adheres to the Septuagintal interpretation. Thus 'Kiss the son' is rendered *yprige bnih't* ('apprehendite disciplinam.' Vulg.). It is well known that every national Psalter, except the *Gallican*, follows the LXX. as derived from the usage of the Primitive Church.

terms in the LXX. and shows they are exactly identical. His Essay is short, and therefore it contains but a small sample of a great multitude. But it is sufficient to prove the point at issue, and also to whet the appetite to enlarge the inquiry. We heartily wish that a doctrinal lexicon of the New Testament on this principle was published for the use of the younger clergy. It would prove an effectual barrier against rationalistic interpretations.

We think that we cannot better conclude this brief notice of Mr. Churton's Essay, than in his own comprehensive summary: 'It has been the intention, in the words above instanced, to give the most important examples of the influence of the language of the Alexandrian version. In some cases, the forms adopted may be merely Hebrew idioms literally rendered by the interpreters. But many of the expressions there introduced into the Greek language are sanctioned by the Inspired teacher of the Truth, as being the nearest approach which human language could make to a true description of the deep mysteries of the Divine Nature, and of man's relation to God. These mysteries, as they transcend all understanding, are even still more removed from the grasp of language, which is the expression of thought. But by the combination of idioms of the Hebrew and Greek tongues (of which the dispersion of the Jews was by the providence of God the immediate occasion), a language was produced of that rich and copious nature which Christian doctrine required, to enable men to comprehend what is the depth and length and breadth and height of the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge.'—P. 119. 'In this sense, the Hellenistic dialect was one of the chosen means by which God declares the truths of the Gospel to man.'—P. 21.

As the theme of Mr. Churton's Hulsean Essay was proposed by the Trustees for the year 1859, it could not have entered into their design to counteract the influence of the 'Essays and Reviews.' Yet a more effective refutation of their sceptical teachings concerning Divine Inspiration, and more especially of Mr. Jowett's 'free and easy' treatment of the doctrinal language of the New Testament, has not yet appeared, nor is likely to appear hereafter. *It is the more unanswerable, because it was not intended as an answer.* It almost corresponds to what mathematicians mean by *superior position*. The doctrinal terminology of the LXX. is placed over against the doctrinal terminology of the Gospels and Epistles, and it is found exactly of the same dimensions. We think that the *Verbal* Inspiration of the New Testament was never before so accurately, so *ocularly*, ascertained and demonstrated.

ART. VI.—1. *Œuvres inédites de Monsieur Dufriche-Desgenettes, Curé de Notre-Dame-des-Victoires, à Paris, Fondateur de l'Archiconfrérie du saint et immaculé Cœur de Marie, pour la conversion des Pécheurs ; contenant ses Sermons, Prônes, Instructions, Plans et Notes sur divers sujets de la Religion, précédées d'une Notice biographique, d'un Portrait de l'Auteur et d'un autographe de sa main.* Publiées sous la direction de M. L'ABBÉ G. DESFOSSÉS, Vicaire de la Paroisse. Paris: Librairie du Saint-Cœur de Marie de A. Levesque.

FOR many years M. Desgenettes occupied a high position among the French clergy. At the period of his death, he was perhaps the most eminent and conspicuous parish priest in France. The famous Association he established, the many works of charity he promoted or organized, his habits of free intimacy with some of the greatest men in his country, his extensive relations and influence, the extraordinary honours that were paid him, the patriarchal age he attained, with activity unabated and intellect unimpaired, his many Christian virtues, his moral grandeur and reputed sanctity, all contributed to invest him with a degree of eminence and celebrity seldom equalled. Believing that an account of this remarkable man may be interesting and instructive to English readers, we proceed in this paper to give, without attempting minutely to analyse character and feelings, a sketch of his life and chief works of charity, as well as to offer some remarks on his sermons and style of preaching. Though he has scarcely been dead a twelvemonth, some eight or ten accounts of him have already appeared, which, whatever may be their dissimilarity in some respects, possess at least these two interesting features in common,—namely, the lofty eulogiums they pass on M. Desgenettes, and the manner in which they, one and all, though professing to be published independently, frequently recount, in the true French style, the same facts in nearly the same words! Of these biographies, that of M. Desfossés, who was for twelve years his assistant-curate and who attended him at his last moments, and is now the editor of his works, is the most recent, and, though not particularly remarkable for elegance of diction or luminous arrangement of matter, seems the most detailed and the best. His life of M. Desgenettes, included in the four volumes mentioned at the head of this article, we shall therefore chiefly use, adding a few facts here and there about the late

Curé of Notre-Dame-des-Victoires, which have reached us from private sources. It is true that strange events are sometimes recorded, and startling demands occasionally made on our faith, but we must recollect that marvels are always to be met with in the best authenticated of ultramontanist biographies.

Charles-Eléonore Dufrique-Desgenettes was born at Alençon, on the 10th August, 1778. His family, which was one of great antiquity, had long been settled there, his father and ancestors for several successive generations filling the office—which, especially under the old *régime*, usually descended from father to son—of magistrate in that town. His mother's name is not recorded. She seems to have been an excellent woman, who, from her son's tenderest youth, sedulously endeavoured to instil right principles into his mind. Young Desgenettes did not remain long in his native town. In 1783, his father was appointed *Procureur du Roi* at Sées, and thither the whole family removed.

Macaulay has observed of Johnson, that 'in the child, the physical, intellectual, and moral peculiarities which afterwards distinguished the man, were plainly discernible;'¹ and this was in a great measure the case with Desgenettes. He was of a very robust constitution from the first. From the first he decided to devote himself to the work of the priesthood. From the first, also, he displayed great acuteness, ardour, earnestness, and intellectual activity; he was, likewise, extremely high-minded, sensitive, and enthusiastic. But his good qualities were accompanied by an impetuosity and an intractableness, a spirit of self-will and obstinacy, a pertinacity of opinion, a *fougue* and a *brusquerie*, which gave much anxiety to his mother, and which, to his latest day, the man found it difficult to shake off completely. "Plutôt qu'il meure!" s'écriait sa mère, dans la ferveur de sa tendresse alarmée,' says one of his biographers.²

'Ses inquiétudes,' he continues, 'ses remontrances faisaient une vive impression sur son fils, qui la cherchait; il prodiguait les plus belles et les plus sincères promesses, allait devant un petit autel, qu'il avait élevé dans la maison, réciter le *Miserere* dans les sentiments d'un profond repentir, s'assurait qu'il était devenu un homme nouveau, chantait le *Te Deum* en actions de grâces de sa conversion, et recommençait le lendemain à affliger sa bonne mère par ses méfaits enfantins!'

This portrait is quite characteristic of Desgenettes, and

¹ *Biographies*, p. 77.

² M. de Valette. He was for the long period of thirty-two years the intimate friend of M. Desgenettes, and sometime Sub-Director of the *Archiconfrérie du très-saint et immaculé Cœur de Marie*. He is now Chaplain of the Lycée Napoléon, and Honorary Canon of Digne.

thoroughly French. The *petit autel* here mentioned is one which he himself had constructed. On this altar the image of the Blessed Virgin occupied a prominent place. He used to decorate it with the choicest flowers, and to say his prayers before it.

M. de Valette says truly that no sooner was he forgiven than he recommenced his misdoings. On one occasion, his Confessor having reproved him somewhat severely, the following curious dialogue took place:—

“Que voulez-vous devenir enfin?” says the priest.

“Ce que je veux devenir? mais ce que vous êtes,” answered the child unhesitatingly.

“Vous, mon enfant?”

“Oui, moi. Je veux être prêtre.”

“Dans ce cas, vous avez bien à faire avant de songer à devenir prêtre. Il faut d’abord songer à vous corriger.”

“Eh bien, je me corrigerai.”—Vol. i. p. vi.

He also showed a remarkable precocity. When only three years old he could read well. At six, a somewhat early age for a French youth, he commenced learning Latin, and at seven was put into the fifth class of the college at Séz, where he greatly distinguished himself. His moral improvement, however, scarcely kept pace with his intellectual cultivation and attainments. At the age of twelve, he was the same wayward, intractable, headstrong boy he had ever been. The period had now arrived at which he ought to receive his first Communion. ‘Mais, d’accord avec sa mère,’ says M. Desfossés, ‘ses maîtres voulurent tenter un suprême effort sur ce caractère indomptable. Il fut donc résolu qu’il ne serait admis à la Table sainte que six semaines après ses condisciples.’ This proved a source of great humiliation to young Desgenettes, and it is said it produced a beneficial and permanent effect upon him.

In 1791, the *Procureur du Roi* of Séz was appointed, first of all, Judge, and, subsequently, President of the tribunal of Dreux. When M. Desgenettes removed to Dreux he entered his son at the College of Chartres. Here, as at Séz, young Desgenettes applied himself to his studies with great diligence, and was a great favourite both with his masters and his school-fellows. A curious occurrence, related by most of his biographers, and strikingly illustrative of the youth’s religious principles, must not be omitted here. The Civil Constitution of the Clergy, as it is called, had recently been decreed by the National Assembly. It was at this time the custom for the pupils in the Government colleges to go to confession; but the college confessor, like all the rest of the clergy who were allowed to exercise the functions of their office, was, of course, a *prêtre assermenté*. His name

was Vitalis,¹ and he was Vicar-General to the *de facto* Bishop of Chartres, Mgr. Bonnet. Now, young Desgenettes, regarding all priests who had taken the oath as intruders and schismatics, determined not to confess to M. Vitalis; and in this resolution he was confirmed by the advice of some clergymen, intimate friends of his family, and who themselves had refused to take the oath. To confession, however, the college regulations compelled him to go. He himself has narrated what passed on that occasion between the Abbé Vitalis and himself:—

‘ Arrivé aux pieds du confesseur, je dus faire comme mes condisciples. Je me mis à genoux, mais je restai bouche close. Alors, entre M. Vitalis et moi, eut lieu le dialogue suivant :

“ Mais dites donc votre *Confiteor*, mon ami.”

“ Monsieur, je ne dis pas de *Confiteor*.”

“ Et pourquoi donc, s’il vous plaît ? ”

“ Parce que je ne viens pas ici de mon plein gré, mais emmené de force par la règle. Je ne me confesse pas, moi, aux prêtres assermentés. Vous n’êtes pas catholique.”

“ Vous, encore un enfant, vous vous croyez donc capable de décider de pareilles questions, des questions si graves ? Vous croyez donc en savoir à ce sujet plus que moi, plus que mes confrères, plus que M. Bonnet lui-même, notre Evêque ? Allons, enfant, confessez-vous.”

“ Je vous répète que je ne veux pas me confesser à vous ; car vous n’avez pas de pouvoirs. M. Bonnet, que vous appelez votre Evêque d’ Eure-et-Loire, n’a pas plus de pouvoir que vous ; il ne peut donc pas vous en donner ; il n’est pas plus évêque que moi, il n’est qu’un intrus.”

“ Mais savez-vous que vous manquez de respect aux autorités établies ? ”

“ Vous vous trompez, Monsieur. Je vénère, au contraire, l’autorité, la seule autorité qui existe dans l’Eglise de Jésus-Christ. Si je vous tiens ce langage qui semble vous blesser, c’est parce que notre Saint-Père le Pape, dans son bref du 13 Avril, ordonne aux ecclésiastiques qui ont prêté le serment de le retracter, et déclare que les élections, ainsi que la consécration des nouveaux évêques, sont illégitimes, sacrilèges, et par conséquent nulles.”

“ Où en sommes-nous donc maintenant pour que des écoliers viennent nous citer des brefs ? Vous avez donc des relations avec la cour de Rome ? ”

“ Vous en avez-bien, vous, avec la cour de Satan ! . . . ”

“ A ces mots, piqué au vif, M. Vitalis me congédia.”—Vol. i. pp. ix. x.

This was pretty well for a stripling of thirteen ! Here the discussion ended, as well it might ! We will here chronicle another event which occurred while young Desgenettes was at the College of Chartres, and which, again, forcibly illustrates a prominent feature in his character, and shows that he was as rigid in the maintenance of his political as of his religious convictions. 1793 had arrived. The King had been guillotined on the 21st January, and his death had produced such an impression upon Desgenettes that his health had suffered in consequence. The College vacations were about to take place, and the

¹ M. Vitalis, an excellent man *d’ailleurs*, afterwards recanted, and died Curé of Saint-Eustache in Paris.

prizes distributed; while young Desgenettes' own scholastic career was drawing to a close. As is always the case, there was a large gathering on the occasion. The very *élite* of the population of Chartres had met in the former Church of the Cordeliers, now transformed into a museum, to witness the imposing spectacle. The Government commissioner, Jean-Bon-Saint-André,¹ occupied the president's chair. A dead silence prevailed while the names of the different laureats were announced. Charles Desgenettes had obtained the prize for Latin translation. His father's high position, the respect in which his family was held, and his own college successes—everything combined to draw the particular attention of the company present upon young Desgenettes. All eyes were fixed on him as he left his place, and went up to the platform. Already, the president was preparing to crown young Desgenettes, to congratulate him on his success, and—to embrace him! But we will allow M. Desfossés to speak:—

‘Au lieu de se diriger vers lui, Charles s’arrête tout à coup sur les bords de l’estrade, en face de la nombreuse assemblée qui suit des yeux chacun de ses mouvements. D’une main, il tient sa couronne, de l’autre, son prix. Il salue, en s’inclinant devant l’assistance, et se retire sans daigner jeter même un regard sur le président. Ce mode nouveau de recevoir une couronne surprend et étonne d’abord, mais on comprend aussitôt. Les élèves frappent de nombreux applaudissements, suivis de ceux des nouveaux assistants. Un murmure unanime d’admiration couronne la hardiesse du vainqueur. Jean Bon sent vivement le trait qui lui est lancé. Mais il a du tact, il se contente donc de se venger, par un sourire de dédain et par une distraction, chaque fois que le hardi jeune homme vient recevoir un nouveau prix’—Vol. i. pp. xi. xii.

Like many other enthusiastic minds, M. de Desgenettes had hailed the Revolution with joy, but he soon became disgusted with its follies and its crimes. After the death of the king, the prefect of Eure-et-Loir exacted the adhesion of all the magistrates of the department to the sentence of the Convention. M. Desgenettes refused his, and resigned his office. In 1794, he was accused of disaffection to the government, and three commissioners of the Committee of Public Safety, accompanied by gendarmes and some members of the revolutionary committee of Dreux, went to his house to arrest him. Not finding him at home, they wished to retain Madame Desgenettes as security. ‘Arrêtez-moi,’ exclaimed young Desgenettes, ‘si vous croyez la liberté d’une femme dangereuse à la république, mais laissez libres ces enfants que la prison tuerait.’ The house was searched,

¹ The well-known member of the Committee of Public Safety, and friend of Robespierre. This worthy, it will be remembered, proposed in the National Convention the condemnation and death of Louis XVI. without any form of legal proceeding!

and all M. Desgenettes' papers, letters, &c. were examined. Nothing, however, was discovered of a nature to compromise the family, in spite of the perspicacity of one of the commissioners, a grocer at Dreux, who, perceiving a manuscript copy of Machiavel's maxims, exclaimed with delight: 'Nous tenons 'notre affaire! . . . Qui est ce Machiavel? Il est bien sûr dans 'la Vendée!'

On M. Desgenettes' return home, he was seized and thrown into prison. Young Desgenettes at once determined to effect his release. On the 4th August, 1794, he attended a meeting of the club at Dreux, and harangued the tumultuous assemblage, telling them among other things:—

'Vous êtes le peuple souverain, et, en votre présence, on vient arracher à votre amour votre père, votre époux! Voyez combien de familles sont dans le deuil! Et quel crime ont-ils commis, ceux qu'on tient ainsi captifs?...Levez-vous donc, il est temps. Que la honte d'une soumission aussi basse que coupable ne souille plus vos fronts. Rendez donc à la liberté et à leur famille ces hommes nombreux que vous aimiez à voir au milieu de vous, que vous environniez de votre estime, que vous appelez vos frères. Oui, c'est l'heure, levez-vous, et la ville entière acclamera votre courage.'—Vol. i. p. xiv.

Charles Desgenettes was vehemently applauded. A commission composed of twenty members of the club, and presided over by himself, was at once named for the opening of the prisons; and in a few moments M. Desgenettes and a hundred and fifty other heads of families were restored to liberty.

We will not stop to recount the strange vicissitudes and perilous adventures of young Desgenettes, from his fifteenth year to the period when he was admitted to the priesthood—his dangerous illness and extraordinarily sudden recovery—how, both at Dreux and at Saint-Lomer, he used to leave home at night and seek out those priests who had refused the oaths to the Constitution in their obscure retreats for the purpose of relieving them—how he opened a school for the gratuitous education and catechising of the children of the poor—how, when the reign of terror was at its height, he was accustomed to *faire le prêtre*, holding, both at his own home and in the suburbs of Dreux and Saint-Lomer, religious meetings and explaining the Scriptures—how, on one occasion, he put himself at the head of large crowds of women, presented himself before the Government Commissioner, and demanded the reopening of those churches that had been closed—and how, finally, he was summoned before the Prefect¹ at Alençon, accused *de faire le*

¹ Curiously enough, this same Prefect became later one of M. Desgenettes' parishioners at Notre-Dame-des-Victoires. They met, and the quondam Prefect thus addressed the Curé:—'Vous étiez un brave jeune homme; je vous tracassais ainsi, parce que j'avais reçu des ordres supérieurs, mais je vous estimais intérieure-

prêtre, of being a *chouan*, and so forth. From his most tender years, as we have seen, Charles Desgenettes had decided upon taking orders. His father, however, who had now become a judge at the tribunal of Mortagne, wished him to follow his own profession, but for this young Desgenettes had a strong aversion. He then prevailed upon Charles to take to medicine like his cousin,¹ which he did; but, after a six months' study, he gave it up, and prepared himself for the priesthood. For this purpose, he entered the Seminary of Séez, in 1803. The first Consul had successfully terminated his negotiations with the Pope, the Concordat passed into a law, and the Christian religion was now re-established throughout France. On the 9th June, 1805, Desgenettes was ordained priest. The day after his ordination he was appointed Curé of Saint-Lomer and *vicaire* of Courtomer. Eight months afterwards, he was transferred, to the great regret of his parishioners, to the assistant curacy of Argentan, to which was soon added that of S. Martin's. In 1811, M. de Fontanes, the *grand-maitre* of the University of France, established three years before by Napoleon, offered the Abbé Desgenettes the principalship of the College of Séez, which, in consequence of the many difficulties that stood in the way, he felt compelled to decline. Whilst at Argentan, the Abbé lost his excellent mother, whom he had left at Courtomer. As soon as he had been apprised of her illness, he had hastened to see her; and their last interview was very affecting. He himself performed the funeral service. He has left on record a strange account of how, after her death, eight days before the Feast of the Assumption, he heard her call to him several times, '*Desgenettes! Desgenettes!*' On the eve of the Assumption, she herself appeared to one of his Curé's servants, who had already heard her voice, on the same occasion as the Abbé, and seen her. Let us hear the Abbé's own account of her apparition:—

'Huit jours après, la veille de l'Assomption, elle est encore réveillée, en sursaut, par un bruit de voix. Elle regarde, et me voit assis, à côté de la même dame qu'elle avait vue huit jours auparavant. Voici ce que cette dame me disait: *Desgenettes, sois entièrement tranquille sur mon sort, car, aujourd'hui même, Dieu m'a fait grâce. Rassure-toi aussi sur les messes qui m'ont été confiées par ta tante Lefebvre. J'ai remis ces messes à M. S..., curé de X..., à l'abbé de B..., à M. L..., à M. D..., et à M. B... Quant à la sœur Des-*

ment.' M. Desgenettes answered him, smiling:—'*Vous me faisiez la guerre, mais c'était une guerre bon chat bon rat, car je vous tenais tête.*' This man, for a long period an infidel, became converted under the Curé of Notre-Dame-des-Victoires ministrations.

¹ M. Desgenettes was, if we mistake not, first cousin to the celebrated physician of the same name, Nicolas-Réné Dufriche-Desgenettes, a great favourite of Napoleon I. and created baron by him.

champs, je lui devais 37 livres et 10 sous, mais elle est allée trouver ton père à Mortagne, et il l'a payée aujourd'hui même. Les sacrifices que tu as faits pour moi à l'heure de la mort, m'ont beaucoup servi devant Dieu.—Vol. i. p. xlii.

His father soon followed his mother to the grave. On hearing of his dangerous illness, the Abbé went immediately to Mortagne, and found his father insensible. He, however, rallied a few moments after, and confessed to his son. An hour afterwards, he expired. The Abbé again performed the funeral service. The judge had, at one period of his life, imbibed the infidel opinions then so prevalent, but had since recanted them; and, not long before his death, he had written a most touching letter to his son, full of the noblest religious sentiments.

Whilst at Argentan, the Abbé Desgenettes gave his undivided attention to the care of his flock and to the instruction of youth. An instance of his thorough self-devotion and high moral fortitude in a trying emergency, which occurred towards the conclusion of his ministry in that town, is recorded by his biographers. It is a more pleasing, as well as better authenticated and more credible narrative than that of his Curé's servant girl:—

'L'année de 1813 touchait à sa fin,' says M. Desfossés, 'lorsqu'on vit arriver, à Argentan, un nombreux dépôt de blessés et de prisonniers de guerre. Un ancien couvent fut assigné pour leur servir, à la fois, d'hôpital et de prison. Une inexorable incurie imposa bientôt à ces malheureux le supplice de la faim. Le cœur de l'abbé Desgenettes fut navré de douleur, au récit de leur misère. Un jour qu'il vit lui-même plusieurs de ces infortunés captifs, tendre aux enfants, par les fenêtres, leurs mains suppliantes, et implorer du pain, ils se rendit sur la place publique, auprès d'un officier de gendarmerie, lui adressa de justes reproches, discuta, demanda et obtint son entrée libre dans la prison. Muni de cette autorisation, il se rendit aussitôt au couvent, emportant avec lui les secours les plus nécessaires. Bientôt il sut intéresser à son œuvre toutes les âmes charitables, et organiser des quêtes.

'Mais le cœur du prêtre eut à supporter les émotions les plus préribles, comme aussi il put recueillir les plus grandes consolations au milieu de tant de douleurs.

'Les prisonniers étaient entassés les uns sur les autres. Le typhus se déclara. Les morts s'amoncelèrent. C'est alors que l'abbé Desgenettes redoubla de zèle et d'activité. Parmi tous ces Allemands, il avait découvert un officier hongrois qui parlait latin. Il en fit son interprète. Impossible de dire la joie de tous ces malheureux, décimés chaque jour si impitoyablement par la mort, à l'arrivée de leur généreux et infatigable ami. Sur son passage, tous faisaient le signe de la croix et récitaient quelques prières, afin de se faire reconnaître catholiques. A chacun le bon prêtre adressait une bonne parole, un secours. Il entendait les confessions. Il se multiplait partout, et luttait, par son zèle, avec la maladie et la mort.'—Vol. i. pp. xlv. xlv.

But soon M. Desgenettes himself caught the disease. For three weeks he lay at death's door. During the whole time, as he had often done before under the same circumstances, he refused to see a doctor; 'il connaissait par expérience la toute

puissance de Dieu.' He eventually recovered, but with the partial loss of his memory, which before was a remarkably retentive one.¹

Meanwhile the Abbé was about to leave Argentan. Napoleon had quarrelled with the Pope, who was now a captive at Fontainebleau, and who refused canonical institution to the bishops named by the emperor. In this emergency, the government had instructed the diocesan chapters to invest the bishops whom they had nominated with the authority of capitular vicars-general. The Pope had formally protested against these uncanonical proceedings, and a schism was again imminent. Such was the state of things in the French Church, when M. Baton, canon and vicar-general of Rouen, was appointed Bishop of Séz. Most of the clergy of the diocese refused to acknowledge him. Under these circumstances, they resolved to send a deputation to the Pope, to lay before him the state of the diocese, and to know what was to be done; and M. Desgenettes was chosen for that purpose. He had an interview with the Abbé Della Rocca, who put him into communication with Cardinal Gabrielli. The Cardinal was so much struck with the Abbé Desgenettes, that he at once appointed him apostolical administrator of the diocese of Séz. The Abbé, however, declined the proffered dignity; upon this he was asked by the Cardinal whom he considered the fittest person in the diocese, for that office; and M. Desgenettes named the Abbé Levavasseur, who was forthwith appointed. M. Baton was greatly irritated when he heard of what had been done, and doubtless the Abbé Desgenettes would have been severely punished for the share he had taken in these proceedings had not the Bourbons returned. We need hardly say that the Abbé hailed their re-establishment on the throne with great joy; but this joy was to be of short duration. On Napoleon's return from Elba, the Abbé was obliged to flee. Had he not fled, he would have been arrested and taken to Vincennes. He escaped to Caen, and there concealed himself in the house of an intimate friend. At the end of the Hundred Days we find him in Paris, anxious to become a member of the Society of Jesus. He was, however, dissuaded from taking this step by the famous Jesuit, the Père de la Clorivière, who told him that his sphere of duty was elsewhere, and who, as his biographer informs us with great solemnity, predicted that he should become curé in a parish where he would have much to endure, and then be removed to

¹ This failure of his memory may partly account for the fact noticed by Dr. Wordsworth, in his *Diary in France* (p. 199), namely, the Abbé ever and anon, while preaching, 'taking a pinch of snuff to gain a little time for thought, and to stimulate his ideas;' though it is well known he was an inveterate snuff-taker.

Paris. The parish thus prophetically announced, was Montsort, a suburb of Alençon, to which the Abbé was presented in 1816, and where he remained four years. In another respect, the Jesuit's prediction was also verified—the Abbé had certainly much to endure there. The inhabitants of Montsort were remarkable for their revolutionary opinions, and commenced by refusing to receive their new curé, whose strong legitimist principles were well known to them; and they would even have prevented his installation had it not been for the gendarmerie. By his devotion, self-denial, and zeal for the interests of his people, he soon contrived to gain the goodwill of many; nevertheless, he continued to the end to have many enemies, and to be subjected to many *tracasseries*. At length an event occurred which necessitated the abandonment of his cure. We give it in M. Desfossés' words. It not only serves to illustrate the truth of Father de la Clorivière's prophecy, as the biographer reminds us repeatedly in the course of his narrative, but also how, both civilly and ecclesiastically, things are occasionally managed in France. French ultramontanists are fond of representing the Anglican Church as the creature and slave of the State; but people little know how much this is the case with the French Church, and how the French clergy, both beneficed and unbeneficed, are too often in a state of abject dependence, not only upon their Bishops, but also upon the civil authorities, and especially upon the minister of Public Worship.

'Un jour de fête,' says M. Desfossés, 'à l'office des vêpres, en présence du Très-Saint Sacrement exposé, le saint Curé aperçoit une dame qui, par sa tenue irrévérencieuse, troublait le recueillement et la piété des fidèles. Il envoie le bedeau la rappeler poliment à l'ordre. Au lieu d'obtempérer à une si juste demande, la dame s'irrite et redouble ses irrévérences. Alors, l'abbé Desgenettes, qui s'aperçoit du désordre sacrilège qu'elle occasionne dans le saint lieu, se recueille un instant, et prie. Puis, l'interpellant lui-même avec modération, il la conjure de mettre fin à ses propos ou de sortir. Le démon qui a soufflé l'irrévérence souffle aussitôt la vengeance dans le cœur de cette femme. Elle s'emporte jusqu'aux injures, et court raconter à son mari que le curé l'a insultée, en pleine église, et a voulu l'assassiner. Le mari irrité va aussitôt trouver ceux qu'il connaît être les ennemis implacables du zélé pasteur, parce que l'ignorance et la mauvaise conduite de leurs enfants ne lui ont pas permis de les admettre à la première communion. On décide qu'il faut en finir, et il va déposer au parquet les plaintes de sa femme.'

'Cependant, au milieu de la tempête que les passions conjurées de ses ennemis soulevaient contre lui, M. l'Abbé Desgenettes jouissait de la tranquillité que donne une conscience qui a fait son devoir et qui a Dieu pour lui. Un jour, dans une maison amie, il se rencontre avec le président du tribunal; et, la conversation y menant, il lui raconte le fait, tel qu'il est arrivé. Le noble magistrat voit aussitôt combien sa bonne foi a été surprise, et l'assure de sa protection et de sa justice.'

'Sur ces entrefaites, le ministre des cultes, trompé par de faux rapports, écrivait à l'évêché pour obtenir la révocation du curé.'

‘L’autorité ecclésiastique, qui connaissait le droit du noble persécuté, temporisait, lorsqu’elle reçut une nouvelle lettre du ministre qui rendait pleine justice à M. Desgenettes. Le président du tribunal avait écrit à M. Lainé et l’avait éclairé. L’instruction n’eut donc pas de suite.’—Vol. i. p. lvii.

The Abbé, however, resigned his cure, in spite of his Bishop’s urgent entreaties and remonstrances. It was now his intention to enter the Bon-Sauveur at Caen, but, pressed by a friend whom he accidentally met, he decided to accompany him to Paris, and there he was introduced to M. Desjardins, the eminent curé of the parish des Missions Etrangères, who appointed him one of his assistant curates. Soon afterwards, when the Abbé Desjardins was chosen Vicar-General of Paris by the Archbishop—the Cardinal de Périgord—and was consulted by the Cardinal as to a fit successor, the Abbé strongly recommended M. Desgenettes, who was presented to the cure, and who applied himself with his accustomed energy to the enlarged sphere of duty and weightier responsibilities now devolving upon him. Our space precludes our detailing all that he did in his new capacity. Besides performing with unsurpassed diligence the usual routine of duties, such as receiving confessions, preaching, and so forth, incumbent upon curés, he restored his church and provided for it the requisite ornaments, obtained an augmentation of the salaries of his assistant curates, built schools, established orphanages, and organized various *œuvres*, which are in a very flourishing condition at this day. Among these good works the celebrated *Maison de la Providence*, in the Rue Oudinot, for the reception of female orphans, deserves special mention. The Abbé spent more than 500,000 francs upon it. Since its foundation it has received within its walls some 1,600 girls; and it is conducted on such excellent principles that it has served as a model for several orphanages both in Paris and in the departments. How the Abbé contrived to obtain the necessary funds for carrying out his good works is not explained to us; the sum expended upon them must have been enormous. It is true he had several exalted and munificent friends and patrons, and among them Charles X. and the Duchess of Angoulême. On one occasion the King sent him 30,000 francs for the *Maison de la Providence*, and begged the Abbé to recommend him to the prayers of his orphans. The Abbé was admitted to a *tête-à-tête* with the King several times; and each time he went to the palace Charles told him with a smile, ‘*Eh bien ! mon cher curé ! comment vont vos enfants ?*’

The Curé des Missions Etrangères was on terms of great intimacy with the papal nuncio, Mgr. Lambruschini, who wished to see him promoted to the episcopate. We are told

that the Cardinal went expressly to see the Minister of Public Worship, Mgr. Frayssinous, to ask him for a mitre for his friend. His intervention, however, proved unavailing. 'Telle n'était pas la volonté de Dieu,' says M. Desfossés. 'Le ministre promit ; mais le dévouement à toute épreuve de l'Abbé Desgenettes au Saint-Siège, ses sentiments tout à fait ultramontains, l'activité, l'énergie de son zèle, engagèrent le ministre à différer d'en faire la proposition au roi.' We must demur to what the biographer states here as to the Abbé Desgenettes' activity and zeal being, in the eyes of Frayssinous, a bar to his promotion. The Bishop of Hermopolis was not only the most eloquent preacher of the time of the Restoration, but he was also a very high-principled and zealous man ; and he would have been the last to obstruct M. Desgenettes' promotion on account of his activity and energy. The real obstacle to the Abbé's advancement was simply his '*tête ardente*' and his violent ultramontanism ; and, as a staunch and sincere Gallican, the minister would not promote him to a bishopric.

The Abbé Desgenettes had for some time projected the erection of a larger and handsomer church than the Missions Etrangères, precisely on the spot where the magnificent church of Sainte-Clotilde now stands. The city of Paris could not assist him in consequence of the expense it had recently incurred in the erection of the churches of the Madeleine and Saint Vincent de Paul. Charles X. had, however, promised him large subsidies from his own private purse ; and the Abbé was about to take the preliminary steps for the construction of the church when the Revolution of 1830 broke forth. It was an event which inflicted a rude shock upon his political and religious principles, and a deep wound upon his private feelings. At this period he was spending a few days at Montrouge, at the noviciate of the Jesuits, which was sacked by the rabble. He immediately returned to Paris, and is said to have supplied provisions to the royal troops shut up in the barracks of Babylone. On the ensuing October he resigned his cure, and retired to Fribourg.

Various causes have been assigned for his voluntary banishment. It has been said that he had incurred heavy debts in carrying out his various works of charity. It has also been said that he feared the revolutionary mobs. We know in what aversion the clergy of Paris were held for some time after the 'three glorious days.' We know that no ecclesiastic durst show himself in the street without great danger. We know also that, so opposed to religion was the revolutionary frenzy of the period, that the church of Saint-Germain l'Auxerrois was devastated and profaned by the most abominable saturnalia of a ruffianly and atheistic rabble,

and the archiepiscopal palace demolished. We do not, however, think the reasons alleged are the true ones.¹ The Abbé's departure was caused rather by his desire to recruit his broken health, and by an affection for the fallen dynasty whose exile he wished to share. He returned to Paris in May, 1832. Soon after his return the Minister of Public Worship, M. Girod de l'Ain, in spite of M. Desgenettes' strong legitimist opinions, thought of promoting him to the bishopric of Verdun, but the appointment was never carried out. His friends then tried to obtain for him the bishopric of Corsica; but, says M. Desfossés, 'c'était l'heure de la nomination de Dieu.' On the 27th August, 1832, the Archbishop of Paris presented him to the cure of the Church des Petits-Pères, which has since resumed its original name, Notre-Dame-des-Victoires. The Abbé has himself described the state of that parish in his *Manuel de l'Archiconfrérie*. The picture is not very flattering, though the good Abbé has, possibly, slightly over-coloured it with a view to give more relief to the subsequently improved condition of his parish, and to set off the benefits resulting from his obedience to the supernatural and so unequivocally expressed intimation he is about to receive, and which he himself will relate to us presently.

'Il y a dans Paris, dans cette moderne Babylone qui a infecté le monde entier de tous les venins, de toutes les doctrines de la corruption, de l'impiété, de la révolte et du mensonge; il y a dans Paris une paroisse, alors presque inconnue, même d'un grand nombre de ses habitants. Elle est située entre le Palais-Royal et la Bourse, au centre de la ville; sa ceinture se compose de théâtres et de lieux de plaisirs bruyants et publics. C'est le quartier le plus absorbé par les agitations intéressées de la cupidité et de l'industrie, le plus abandonné aux criminelles voluptés des passions de toute espèce. Son église, dédiée à Notre-Dame-des-Victoires, a perdu son nom avec sa gloire; ou ne la connaît plus que sous le nom sans expression de l'église des *Petits-Pères*. En des temps malheureux elle servit à la bourse. Ce temple restait désert, même aux jours des solennités les plus augustes de la religion. Disons plus, disons tout, quoiqu'il nous en coûte; il était devenu un lieu, un théâtre de prostitution, et nous avons été forcé de recourir à la force publique pour en chasser ceux qui le profanaient. Point de sacrements administrés dans cette paroisse, pas même à la mort. C'est en vain que le prêtre monte dans la chaire pour y rompre le pain de la parole, personne pour l'écouter! Une poignée de

¹ The Abbé's biographers bear uniform testimony to the fearlessness and *sang-froid* which he displayed during the insurrections of 1848 and 1849, and the *coup-d'état* of 1851, and how, when the bullets were flying in all directions, he was seen traversing the streets and offering his services to such as needed them. One of them, however, takes occasion from this to hint, with beautiful simplicity, that if he did exhibit any pusillanimity during or after the July revolution, his subsequent courage is to be easily accounted for. 'Si on veut expliquer cette conduite par un sentiment de timidité, que démentent d'ailleurs l'humeur de M. Desgenettes et les allures de sa jeunesse, il faudra avouer que, contrairement à ce qui arrive d'habitude, l'énergie de cette âme s'est développée dans la vieillesse, et que sa transformation devant l'autel de Marie a été complète.'—*Le Curé de N.-D.-des Victoires*, par Maxime de Mont-Rond. p. 51.

chrétiens, et qui craignaient de le paraître, voilà tout le troupeau. Les autres, absorbés par les calculs de l'intérêt et du gain, ou noyés dans les excès des voluptés et des passions, ne connaissent ni l'église ni le pasteur; et si ce triste pasteur tente d'établir quelques relations avec les âmes qui lui sont confiées, on le dédaigne, on le repousse, on le méprise. Il s'entend dire qu'on *n'a pas besoin de lui*, qu'il n'a qu'à se retirer. Si, à force d'employer des sollicitations étrangères, il obtient d'être admis auprès d'un malade en danger, c'est sous condition d'attendre que le malade ait perdu le sentiment, et encore qu'il ne se présentera qu'en habit séculier. À quoi bon sa visite? *Il ne ferait que tourmenter inutilement le malade. Quant à son habit, on ne veut pas le voir; et puis que dirait-on si l'on voyait entrer un prêtre dans notre maison? on nous prendrait pour des Jésuites.* Voilà le degré de foi et d'esprit religieux de cette paroisse."¹—*Manuel de l'Archiconfrérie*, p. 84.

In a letter addressed to Mgr. de Quélen, soon after his nomination, the Abbé Desgenettes thus completes the picture of his parish:—

‘Votre grandeur a daigné me confier la paroisse de Notre-Dame-des-Victoires. . . je ne connais [je connaissais] nullement cette paroisse, je savais à peine où était située son Eglise. Vous me dites, Monseigneur, que c'était une paroisse qui n'en était pas une. Ces paroles me frappèrent, mais je ne m'attendais pas à les trouver si vraies et surtout d'une vérité si étendue. Vous connaissez le genre de population de ce quartier, vous savez combien il est peu religieux, mais ce que vous ignorez sans doute, c'est que la *Gazette des cultes* s'imprimait et se répandait par milliers dans la paroisse, aux derniers jours de la Restauration; que la *Tribune* avait son imprimerie, ses bureaux et son club auprès de mon Eglise; que sept à huit autres journaux impies et immoraux s'imprimaient dans la paroisse; que, pendant les années 1832, 33, 34, et partie de 35, plusieurs loges de carbonaris y étaient établis. . . ; que là, les propos, les discours les plus impies, les plus violents, les propositions les plus atroces, étaient continuellement à l'ordre du jour contre la religion, contre vous, contre moi, et que le misérable S— y promettait hautement de nous assassiner tous les deux. . . . Depuis la révolution de juillet surtout, plus d'administration des sacrements: les malades mouraient sans confession; presque plus de Pâques; l'église était déserte: trente ou quarante personnes à la grand' messe, une douzaine à vêpres, et c'était rare; les prêtres détestés, méprisés, insultés s'ils se trouvaient dans la nécessité de se montrer au dehors avec leur vêtement clérical! Le dimanche qui suivit mon installation était la fête de saint Augustin (un des patrons de l'église). Cette circonstance et un peu la curiosité de voir le nouveau pasteur auraient dû amener quelques personnes à l'église: je ne sais pas si plus de quarante paroissiens assistaient à la grand' messe, mais je comptai à vêpres, au moment du sermon: nous étions trente-huit, en comptant le prédicateur qui ne put s'empêcher d'exprimer son mécontentement. J'essayais de faire des visites; je fus reçu avec une malhonnêteté marquée; on me repoussait en qualité de prêtre.’—Vol. i. p. lxxv. lxxvi.

¹ We do not of course wish to depreciate the Abbé's labours, but we must bear in mind that this statement, and other portions of his description of his church and parish, are more or less applicable to the then position of most of the Paris ecclesiastics and the condition of their churches and parishes; though there is no doubt that his own enjoyed a pre-eminent and unenviable notoriety for irreligion and sin. We must also recollect that the revival in religion which has since taken place is not confined to the parish of Notre-Dame-des-Victoires, but has extended in a great measure—at least as far as external devotion is concerned—to most churches and parishes in the French capital.

This state of things was a source of intense grief to the Curé. The material condition of the church was on a par with the spiritual condition of the flock—the sacred vessels, the ornaments, the altars were wretched. A month after his installation, he celebrated a service for the repose of his predecessor's soul; the only person who attended was the late Curé's maid-servant! In his embarrassment and anxiety, he tendered his resignation to the Archbishop, but the Archbishop refused to accept it, and told him to stay, or at least recommended delay. He applied himself with greater energy than ever to the amelioration of his parish, and he gave much time to prayer; still there was no material improvement. A few conversions, it is true, took place; but, says M. Desfossés, 'l'église était toujours un désert, dont le vide navrait le cœur du pasteur.' (Vol. i. p. lxxvii.) Thus four whole years elapsed, and matters remained in pretty much the same state. In spite of the Abbé's earnestness and zeal, in spite of his great experience, in spite of his readiness of resource, no sensible change for the better was effected; and thoroughly disheartened and sad, 'à bout de cœur et de persévérance,' and despairing of ever being able to attract people to church, he had determined, notwithstanding his diocesan's earnest solicitations to the contrary, to relinquish his cure, when an unlooked-for and unprecedented change took place. The extraordinary manner in which this extraordinary change was brought about, the Abbé, whose imagination seemed somewhat over-excited at times, and was fond of the marvellous, has himself related in his *Manuel*:—

'Le 3 Décembre, 1836, fête de saint François Xavier, à neuf heures du matin, je commençais la sainte-messe au pied de l'autel de la sainte Vierge, que nous avons depuis consacré à son très-saint et immaculé Cœur et qui est aujourd'hui l'autel de l'Archiconfrérie; j'en étais au premier verset du psaume *Judica me*, quand une pensée vint saisir mon esprit. C'était la pensée de l'inutilité de mon ministère dans cette paroisse; elle ne m'était pas étrangère, je n'avais que trop d'occasions de la concevoir et de me la rappeler. Mais dans cette circonstance elle me frappa plus vivement qu'à l'ordinaire. Comme ce n'était ni le lieu ni le temps de m'en occuper, je fis tous les efforts possibles pour l'éloigner de mon esprit. Je ne pus y parvenir; il me semblait entendre continuellement une voix qui venait de mon intérieur et qui me répétait : *Tu ne fais rien, ton ministère est nul ; vois, depuis plus de quatre ans que tu es ici, qu'as-tu gagné ? Tout est perdu, ce peuple n'a plus de foi. Tu devrais par prudence te retirer.* Et malgré tous mes efforts pour repousser cette malheureuse pensée, elle s'opiniâtra tellement qu'elle absorba tous les facultés de mon esprit, au point que je lisais, je récitais les prières sans plus comprendre ce que je disais; la violence que je m'étais faite m'avait fatigué, et j'éprouvais une transpiration des plus abondantes. Je fus dans cet état jusqu'au commencement du canon de la messe. Après avoir récité le *Sanctus*, je m'arrêtai un instant, je cherchai à rappeler mes idées; effrayé de l'état de mon esprit, je me dis : *Mon Dieu, dans quel état suis-je ? Comment vais-je offrir le divin sacrifice ? Je n'ai pas assez de liberté d'esprit pour consacrer. O mon Dieu, délivrez-moi de cette malheureuse distraction !* A peine

eus-je achevé ces paroles que j'entendis très-distinctement ces mots prononcés d'une manière solennelle : *Consacre ta paroisse au très-saint et immaculé Cœur de Marie.* A peine eus-je entendu ces paroles, qui ne frappèrent point mes oreilles, mais retentirent seulement au dedans de moi, que je recouvrai immédiatement le calme et la liberté de l'esprit. La fatale impression, qui m'avait si violemment agité, s'effaça aussitôt, il ne m'en resta aucune trace. Je continuai la célébration des saints mystères sans aucun souvenir de ma précédente distraction. Après mon action de grâces, j'examinai la manière dont j'avais offert le saint Sacrifice ; alors seulement je me rappelai que j'avais eu une distraction, mais ce n'était qu'un souvenir confus, et je fus obligé de rechercher pendant quelques instants quel en avait été l'objet. Je me rassurai en me disant : *Je n'ai pas péché, je n'étais pas libre.* Je me demandai comment cette distraction avait cessé, et le souvenir de ces paroles que j'avais entendues se présenta à mon esprit. Cette pensée me frappa d'une sorte de terreur. Je cherchais à nier la possibilité de ce fait, mais ma mémoire confondait les raisonnements que je m'objectais. Je bataillai avec moi-même pendant dix minutes. Je me disais à moi-même : *Quelle fatale pensée ! Si je m'y arrêtais, je m'exposerais à un grand malheur, elle affecterait mon moral, je pourrais devenir visionnaire.* Fatigué de ce nouveau combat, je pris mon parti et je me dis : *Je ne puis m'arrêter à cette pensée ; elle aurait de trop fâcheuses conséquences ; d'ailleurs, c'est une illusion : j'ai eu une longue distraction pendant la messe, voilà tout. L'essentiel pour moi est de n'y avoir pas péché. Je ne veux plus y penser.* Et j'appuie mes mains sur le prie-dieu sur lequel j'étais à genoux. Au moment même, et je n'étais pas encore relevé (j'étais seul dans la sacristie), j'entends prononcer bien distinctement ces paroles : *Consacre ta paroisse au très-saint et immaculé Cœur de Marie.* Je retombe à genoux, et ma première impression fut un moment de stupéfaction. C'étaient les mêmes paroles, le même son, la même manière de les entendre. Il y a quelques instants j'essayais de ne pas croire, je voulais au moins douter ; je ne le pouvais plus, j'avais entendu, je ne pouvais me le cacher à moi-même. Un sentiment de tristesse s'empara de moi les inquiétudes qui venaient de tourmenter mon esprit se présentèrent de nouveau. J'essayai vainement de chasser toutes ces idées ; je me disais : *C'est encore une illusion, fruit de l'ébranlement donné à ton cerveau par la première impression que tu as ressentie. Tu n'as pas entendu, tu n'as pas pu entendre.* Et le sens intime me disait : *Tu ne peux douter, tu as entendu deux fois.* Je pris le parti de ne point m'occuper de ce qui venait de m'arriver, de tâcher de l'oublier. Mais ces paroles : *Consacre ta paroisse au très-saint et immaculé Cœur de Marie* se présentaient sans cesse à mon esprit. Pour me délivrer de l'impression qui me fatiguait, je cède de guerre lasse, et je me dis : *C'est toujours un acte de dévotion à la sainte Vierge qui peut avoir un bon effet ; essayons.* Mon consentement n'était pas libre, il était exigé par la fatigue de mon esprit. Je rentrai dans mon appartement ; pour me délivrer de cette pensée, je me mis à composer les Statuts de notre Association. A peine eus-je mis la main à la plume que le sujet s'éclaircit à mes yeux, et les Statuts ne tardèrent pas à être rédigés. Voilà la vérité, et nous ne l'avons pas dite dans les premières éditions de ce *Manuel*, nous l'avons même cachée au vénérable directeur de notre conscience ; nous en avons fait jusqu'à ce jour un secret même aux amis les plus intimes ; nous n'osions pas le dévoiler, et aujourd'hui que la divine miséricorde a signalé si authentiquement son œuvre par l'établissement, la prodigieuse propagation de l'Archiconfrérie, et surtout par les fruits admirables qu'elle produit, ma conscience m'oblige à révéler ce fait. *Il est glorieux, disait l'archange Raphaël à Tobie, il est glorieux de révéler les œuvres de Dieu, afin que tous reconnaissent qu'à lui seul appartiennent la louange, l'honneur et la gloire.*—Vol. i. pp. lxxviii.—lxxxi.

We will make no comment. Such was the origin of that Association which has since become so famous, and acquired so

extensive a development. No sooner were the rules ready, than M. Desgenettes submitted them to the Archbishop of Paris, Monseigneur de Quélen, who approved them, and formally authorized the *Archiconfrérie*. On the third Sunday in Advent, the 11th December, 1836, M. Desgenettes announced from the pulpit its actual establishment, and his 'intention to implore 'henceforth the protection of the sacred heart of Mary for the 'conversion of sinners.' From that day the offices of the Association have been celebrated every Sunday evening at seven o'clock, as well as on the festivals in honour of the Blessed Virgin and of the Association itself. The services are of a peculiar character: they commence by a hymn in French, and then comes the sermon, after which the preacher reads a list of the persons for whom the prayers of the confraternity are asked—so many men and women, young and old, so many sick, so many afflicted, so many dioceses, so many bishops, so many Protestants, so many heretics, so many Turks, so many Jews, so many infidels, so many sinners, &c. This is followed by the *Salut*, at which are said the *Tantum ergo*, the Litanies of the Blessed Virgin, the *Parce Domine*, and similar prayers. After the blessing, the *Adoremus* is sung three times, and then follow a *Pater* and an *Ave*, with the invocation, *Sancta Maria, Refugium peccatorum, Ora pro nobis*, when the congregation retires singing an additional hymn to the Virgin Mary. This service, which is very novel and attractive, is usually attended by large crowds, consisting, however, principally of women belonging to the humbler classes. They join in it with great fervour and unanimity.

The Association at first encountered a good deal of opposition, especially on the part of a considerable portion of the Paris clergy. The Archbishop himself subsequently became unfavourable to it. Two bishops, who had undertaken to bring the matter before the Pope, and obtain his sanction, afterwards, on reflection, abandoned their intention, as a *démarche indiscretè et tout à fait inutile*. The Curé's zeal, earnestness, and perseverance, however, triumphed finally over all opposition. An influential lady, residing at Rome, having accidentally heard of the Association, asked an audience from the Pope, and herself preferred M. Desgenettes' request on the subject of his Association. Pope Gregory immediately acceded to the request, and issued a brief, dated 24th April, 1838, 'creating and constituting 'à perpétuité, in the church of Notre-Dame-des-Victoires, in 'Paris, l'*Archiconfrérie du très-saint et immaculé Cœur de Marie, 'pour la conversion des pécheurs.*' Gregory, we are told, even did more than he was asked: he extended to the whole world the favour which was asked for France alone. The Curé of Notre-Dame-des-Victoires plainly saw the finger of God in this.

Under such exalted patronage, the *Archiconfrérie* made great progress; and it has included in its roll men of all states and conditions. 'Voici la liste des membres,' says M. Desfossés, quite enthusiastically: 'comptez, ils sont inscrits par millions. Lisez, ce sont des noms de toutes conditions, deux Souverains Pontifes, des monarques, des hommes de guerre, des hommes de loi, des savants, des riches, des pauvres, c'est l'humanité entière!' (Vol. i. p. xcvi.) The *Archiconfrérie* has now more than twenty million members, and sixteen thousand affiliated associations in different parts of the world.

M. Desgenettes' different biographers expatiate largely, and frequently in the very same words, on this his great work, as they regard it, and dilate very enthusiastically on the unprecedented benefits it has conferred, the immense moral regeneration it has accomplished, and on the number of miraculous conversions—commencing with that of M. Joly, one of the last ministers of Louis XVI., and whom M. Desgenettes specially prayed the Blessed Virgin for, and followed by that of Alphonse Ratisbonne—effected by its instrumentality, and some of which are duly chronicled in the *Manuel de l'Archiconfrérie*. But we will allow his principal biographer and curate again to speak:—

'Entrez dans le sanctuaire de Notre-Dame-des-Victoires. C'est bien là que Marie règne et commande par sa bonté et sa miséricorde. La catholicité tout entière s'émeut au récit des prodiges opérés par le nom de Notre-Dame-des-Victoires, et demande à s'affilier à l'Archiconfrérie.

'Le doigt de Dieu est là. Les pécheurs se convertissent, les malades retrouvent la santé, les prodiges de tous genres s'accomplissent. La foule des fidèles de Paris va se prosterner, sans se lasser jamais, aux pieds de la statue de Notre-Dame-des-Victoires. Et toujours le flot augmente. C'est vraiment l'Eglise privilégiée de Paris; elle est pleine de fidèles à toute heure du jour. Pas un étranger qui ne vienne s'agenouiller dans le sanctuaire de Marie, et y déposer des prières pour lui et tous ceux qu'il aime. Là est la vie, parce que là est la confession; là est la communion. Toutes ces merveilles, qui les a opérées? La main d'un simple prêtre.

'Si notre siècle peut à juste titre être proclamé le siècle de Marie, qui est-ce qui lui a procuré cette gloire? Nous ne craignons pas de le dire; c'est M. Desgenettes qui a propagé partout le culte de Marie. Si Pie IX, ce Pontife glorieusement régnant [?], ce saint serviteur de Marie, a proclamé le dogme de l'Immaculée Conception, qui est-ce qui a préparé les convictions et les cœurs dans toute la catholicité à demander cette proclamation? Nous ne craignons pas de le dire hautement, c'est M. Desgenettes, dont l'activité et le zèle ont répandu sur toutes les places du monde la dévotion au saint et immaculé Cœur de Marie.'—Vol. i. p. xcvi. xcix.

M. Desfossés informs us, moreover, as a proof of the good done by the *Archiconfrérie*, that as many as thirty, forty, fifty, and even seventy letters arrive weekly, announcing conversions and unexpected recoveries from illness, all of which have been

obtained by its prayers. We will not take upon ourselves to assert that M. Desgenettes' Confraternity has not done some indirect amount of good, in spite of the radically-vicious foundation upon which the whole superstructure is built; and we will not stop to investigate the origin and reality of the conversions and recoveries adverted to—of the truth of some of which we have good reasons to doubt; but whatever indirect good the *Archiconfrérie* may have done, we fear it has not been unaccompanied by a large amount of direct evil, that it has, indeed, very materially contributed—and this M. Desfossez evidently considers as M. Desgenettes' chief passport to immortality—to the promotion of the Mariolatry so frightfully and universally prevalent in France, and to the promulgation of the dogma of the 8th December, 1854. We have ourselves heard the most extraordinary doctrines—not to use a more special and expressive designation—put forth on the life, and 'privileges, and glories of Mary' from the pulpit of Notre-Dame-des-Victoires, doctrines which, we know, are as strongly denounced and repudiated by many intelligent Roman Catholics, clerical and lay, as they are by Anglicans. Most heartily do we re-echo the sentiments that came into Dr. Wordsworth's mind after attending one of the services of the *Archiconfrérie* in this crowded church, and which he has recorded in one of his *Diaries*: 'Would that a voice from heaven would give a right impulse to the spirit of devotion which there manifested itself; and which (as far as zeal and alacrity are concerned) might supply matter for imitation to other religious communities!'¹

After the establishment of the Confraternity, the Abbé turned his attention to the restoration and embellishment of his church. It was, as we have seen, in a sad condition. The walls and altars were nearly bare, and the organs scarcely fit to use. He had the organs repaired, and the altars and images, especially those of the Blessed Virgin, profusely and luxuriantly decorated. As to the walls, 'les fidèles y pourvoyaient, en les couvrant d'une multitude d'ex voto, et cette bigarrure de marbres, où la reconnaissance envers la Très-Sainte Vierge éclate en mille aspirations diverses, réjouissait la vue du bon prêtre plus que les peintures ou les mosaïques les plus précieuses.' It is now a highly ornamented church.

We need scarcely say that the Curé of Notre-Dame-des-Victoires contemplated with pleasure the restoration in France of the various religious orders, and that he was on terms of great intimacy with Dom Guéranger, Lacordaire, De La

¹ Notes at Paris, p. 106. The reader will find in that very accurate and interesting work a good description of one of the services of the *Archiconfrérie*.

Bouillierie, and others among those who brought about their re-establishment. Dom Guéranger and Lacordaire frequently preached in his church, and so did De La Bouillierie, the founder of the *Adoration nocturne*. It was also at Notre-Dame-des-Victoires, in 1850, that the Capuchins preached for the first time after their restoration.

M. Desgenettes, in conjunction with several well-known writers holding opinions similar to his own, co-operated also largely in establishing two religious periodicals, which, however, enjoyed but a short-lived existence—the *Bulletin Catholique de Bibliographie* and the *Revue Littéraire et Critique*. Of the former, only twelve numbers were published. The latter, which appeared under the auspices of the *Société de Saint-Paul*, of which Balmès, Maupied, Louis Veuillot, Aimédée Gabourd, Ozanam, Charles and Henri de Riancey, were members, lived about three years. The associates of this society used to meet one evening a week, in a small room above the sacristy of Notre-Dame-des-Victoires. The Abbé Desgenettes alludes to it in his *Manuel de l'Archiconfrérie*.

This is how the active Curé usually spent his time. He was up about five o'clock, both summer and winter. From six to nine o'clock he heard confessions in church, after which he said mass. He then returned home and partook of a frugal breakfast, and afterwards received those that wished to visit or consult him. When this was done, he went again to church to receive confessions. At twelve he dined. In the afternoon, he once more received those who wished to see him, either at home or in a small private room that he had close to the sacristy of his church; gave himself to prayer, composed his sermons, and transacted business. He supped at six, and retired to rest about eleven or twelve. On Saturdays, however, he received confessions during the greater part of the day—women in the morning, and men in the evening. He was scarcely ever absent from Paris, and when he did leave, it was only for a short time, to refresh and reinvigorate himself. On these occasions he used to go to a friend's house, at Montmorency. Every Sunday, during the long period of twenty-three years, he regularly presided over the meetings of his Confraternity.

Once only, during the space of twenty-eight years, did he absent himself from Paris for any considerable length of time; and that was on the occasion of his famous trip to Rome, in 1842, of which he has published so circumstantial and fervid an account. It need hardly be stated, that Gregory XVI. granted him immediate audience, and welcomed him with every demonstration of joy and affection. He was accompanied on his voyage by the Abbé Théodore Ratisbonne, then sub-director

of the *Archiconfrérie*, and brother to Alphonse, the famous converted Jew already mentioned. On this memorable occasion, the Curé of Notre-Dame-des-Victoires wore all his decorations—the Cross of the Golden Spur, conferred on him by Leo XII., that of Gregory the Great, conferred on him by Gregory XVI. himself, and that of the Legion of Honour, conferred by Louis Philippe.¹

The 9th July, 1853, was an eventful day for the church of Notre-Dame-des Victoires and for its Curé. We refer to the coronation and adornment with jewels and gold of the images of the Blessed Virgin and of her Son, in the presence of the nuncio, of five bishops, of sixty general officers, including the Duke of Rovigo and General Gemeau, of the mayor of Paris and two of his *adjoints*, of deputations from different religious orders, of the most distinguished ultramontanist ecclesiastics and laymen of Paris, and others. The two crowns, the gift of Pope Pius, were placed, in his name, 'sur la tête de Marie et de son divin Fils,' by Mgr. Pacca, canon of the Chapter of S. Peter's, and by M. Desgenettes himself. It is an event on which the Curé's biographers expatiate with more than habitual congeniality and enthusiasm, but we have neither space nor patience to follow them in the glowing description of the solemn puerilities enacted on that portentous occasion.

We prefer dwelling upon the Curé's warm and diffusive benevolence, and recording some few of his rare acts of noble disinterestedness and active generosity. He was ever ready to assist, both with his advice and his purse, those that came to him; and, for the sake of giving, he not only denied himself many comforts, but frequently subjected himself to many privations. He even, at one period of his life, kept no servant,

¹ The Abbé had the honour of being twice received by the Pope. On the occasion of his second visit, an amusing incident occurred. As both the Abbé Ratisbonne and the Abbé Desgenettes were about to be admitted into Gregory's presence, the former strongly impressed upon his companion, who had a most ineradicable and insatiable propensity for snuff, not to take out his snuff-box quite as often as he had done when paying the first visit. M. Desgenettes faithfully promised to keep careful watch over himself; but no sooner was he in the Pope's presence than he, as it were mechanically, put his hand into his pocket, and took out his unfortunate snuff-box. Suddenly, however, recollecting his promise, he tried to slip it in again without anybody perceiving it. But the Pope had noticed the Abbé's little *manège*; and knowing perfectly and experimentally what a snuff-taker suffers without his snuff, he took out his own box, opened it, and presented it to the Curé, who of course took a large pinch. Some of the Abbé's biographers seem quite amazed at this act of condescension on the part of the Pope, and at the unprecedented honour conferred upon the Curé de Notre-Dames-de-Victoires, to which all other distinctions—the crosses of the Eperon-d'Or, St. Gregory, and Legion of Honour—are not for an instant to be compared. These crosses are common enough, but as M. de Valette sagaciously and profoundly observes, 'Priser dans la tabatière du Pape, cela n'est pas donné à tout le monde!'

in order to be able to bestow more money in charities. When Curé of the Missions Etrangères, he gave 3,000 francs to a *garde-du-corps* for the payment of a debt which was going to cost him his place. On another occasion, he presented 15,000 francs to a merchant, who, but for this bounty, would have been completely ruined, as well as took charge of the education of his two children. In 1834 and 1835, he succeeded in collecting 47,920 francs for the Patriarch of Jerusalem, who was then in Paris in great poverty and heavily in debt; and many times he paid the debts of some of his parishioners who had been arrested and confined in the prison of Clichy. He was particularly kind to the poor of his parish; indeed, we believe M. Desfossés' statement on the subject of his charity to be literally true: 'Sa charité pour secourir les pauvres était grande comme son cœur. Impossible de citer une misère qu'il n'ait secourue aussitôt qu'il l'a connue.'

In all the relations of social life, he seems to have been an indulgent friend, and one in whom the most unlimited and implicit reliance could be placed. He was particularly remarkable for his straightforwardness and high moral rectitude. His demeanour was very inartificial and unassuming, and his conversation lively, animated, and entertaining. In the few hours of careless relaxation he enjoyed in the company of intimate friends he was full of liveliness and fun, and, as our readers have had an opportunity of judging for themselves, used to tell capital stories. In allusion to his fame, which was so widely spread, he once exclaimed, in one of his sportive moods, 'Mon nom! mon nom! c'est une savate qui court le monde!' His temper was cheerful and sympathising, though sometimes acidulated with a considerable quantity of petulance and *brusquerie*.

Neither in youth nor in middle age was the Abbé, as we have seen, particularly remarkable for suavity of manner or equanimity of temper, or even for that external politeness—frequently only external—which is supposed to be one of the predominant characteristics of Frenchmen. Even when far advanced in life, his *vivacité* and petulance would break forth now and then, and this, in spite of all he had done to correct himself of these defects—in spite, to use M. de Mont-Rond's expression, of his 'transformation complète devant l'autel de Marie'—in spite, as another biographer, M. Aubineau, would say, of his being 'enivré des grâces obtenues par le saint Cœur de Marie!' We will give one or two examples of his want of courtesy and even *rudesse*. A lady, the wife of an officer who is about to start for Madagascar, pays him a visit, attracted by his reputed sanctity. She is young and timid, and accosting him with great trepidation, says:—

- “Monsieur le curé.”
- “Qu'est-ce que vous me voulez ?”
- “Je voudrais vous parler.”
- “Vous confessez-vous d'habitude ?”
- “Oui, monsieur le curé.”
- “Eh bien, allez trouver votre confesseur; vous n'avez pas besoin de moi.”
- “Mais, monsieur. . .”
- “Mais, madame, je n'ai pas de temps à perdre pour vous.”
- “Mais ce n'est pas pour moi, c'est pour mon mari, un officier. . .”
- “Eh ! que ne le disiez-vous pas de suite ! C'est tout autre chose.”

He then asks her to sit down, listens to her, and grants the rendezvous she solicited for her husband.

Another lady arrives from the country, bearing a message from a person whom the Abbé had converted. She is so badly received by the Curé that she at once retires. The next day, she follows him after mass to the sacristy. There a young man was already waiting for him. As soon as the Curé sees him, he runs up to him, embraces him, and addresses him with the most affectionate kindness. On the young man's departure, she goes up to the Curé, and tells him :—

- “Vous êtes donc bon quelquefois ?”
- “Que voulez-vous dire, madame ?”
- “Je viens de vous voir si bon avec ce monsieur, et vous m'avez hier si mal reçue.”
- “Moi, allons, ma brusquerie m'a encore joué un de ses tours ! Eh bien, je vous écoute, seulement ne soyez pas trop longue.”

When he knew what she wished to speak to him about, he listened to her with great attention, and gave her the necessary explanations.

No one was more sensible than the Abbé himself of his infirmities of temper. One day Mme. Tisserand, mother of the well-known missionary of that name, the Apostolical Prefect of Guinea, who perished so nobly in the wreck of the *Papin*, said to the Curé of Notre-Dame-des-Victoires, ‘Quel dommage que vous soyez si brusque et si maussade ! On ne sait à quelle heure venir pour vous trouver bon !’ ‘Vous avez bien raison,’ replied he ; ‘je ne suis que mauvais et bourru ; obtenez-moi la grâce de changer.’

On another occasion he addressed the following singular speech to a duchess who was praising his benevolence and charity : ‘Madame, on m'appelle rude abord. Je ne suis qu'un pauvre pécheur, et vous, madame, qu'êtes-vous ?’ He then turned his back upon her, and went away.

These infirmities of temper grieved and humbled the Curé sadly, and he made the best amends he could for them. We are told by M. Desfossés that he ‘expiated them twice annually.’

On the Sunday after his festival, and on the anniversary of his ordination, he ascended the pulpit, and, with the deepest humility, asked pardon for his impatience and petulance, smiting his breast, and styling himself a 'pauvre pécheur.' 'Les larmes qu'il répandait témoignaient de la grandeur de son repentir. Alors l'émotion gagnait l'assistance tout entière, et les larmes de tous prouvaient combien on était touché de tant d'humilité, de tant de grandeur, de tant de sainteté.'—Vol. i. p. cxx.

But infirmities of another nature were now growing fast upon him. His strength was gradually decreasing, and his voice failing him. He celebrated mass for the last time on the 4th November, 1858, the day of the festival of his patron saint, Charles Borromeo. For some time he was regularly carried to the Chapel of the Virgin Mary; eventually, however, he was confined to his house, and had mass celebrated and received confessions in his room. During the winter of 1859–1860 his health gradually and perceptibly declined. Though suffering from a painful malady, or rather from a complication of maladies, he was patient and resigned; his feelings seemed absorbed in feelings for others; and, when reduced to the last stage of weakness, he still continued conversing with spirit and energy on the subjects dearest to his heart—his Confraternity and his flock—and to read all the correspondence connected with the former. As he grew worse, and his end seemed approaching, he evinced great composure; and, when his recovery was hopeless, he even indulged in a little *badinage*—somewhat inopportune perhaps—with his friend Dr. Teissier, who attended him: 'Si vous me guérissez, je vous donne un merle blanc!' In spite of the Doctor's representations and remonstrances, he refused to eat *gras* during the Holy Week of 1860. From that period it became evident that the worst expectations of his friends were soon to be realized. Great was the sensation when the religious journals of the capital announced his dangerous illness, and innumerable were the calls made to know how he was. The Archbishop of Paris visited him several times, and had long conversations with him; so did the Duke and Duchess of Padoue, the Count Germiny, Governor of the Bank of France, Count Châteaubriant, the Abbé Bautain, M. Veuillot, M. Benoît d'Azy, M. Amédée Thayer, M. de Montalembert, and several other *notabilités*; and many were the books, images, chaplets, and medals that were brought to him for his blessing. 'Fervent prayers' also, says M. Desfossés, were addressed for him—not to the God and Saviour of all—but to 'the throne of Mary.' Some of the details recorded of his last moments are very characteristic. During

one of M. Desfossés' visits, the following conversation occurred between himself and the dying man :—

- “ Monsieur le curé, vous offrez vos souffrances à Dieu, n'est-ce pas ? ”
 “ Sans doute, mon fils, qu'en ferais je ? ”
 “ Notre-Seigneur a bien souffert, lui aussi, plus que vous ! ”
 “ Oh ! ce n'est pas comparable. ”
 “ Vous aimez bien la Sainte Vierge ? ”
 “ A ces mots, comme toujours, lorsque je lui parlais de Marie, un doux et rayonnant sourire effleurait ses lèvres et épanouissait sa figure. Il répondit :
 “ A juste titre, je l'aime ! ”
 “ Vous avez bien travaillé pour sa gloire ? ”
 “ Non, mon fils, je n'ai rien fait, ” répondit le saint curé, en remuant négativement la tête.
 “ Mais votre grande œuvre, l'archiconfrérie est là. ”
 “ Ah ! je n'ai pas fait tout ce que j'aurais dû faire. ” —Vol. i. p. cxxix.

To a young man for whom he had obtained a place at the Bank, and who was assisting to remove him from one bed to another, the Curé said, ‘ Voilà le dernier service que vous me rendez. Allons, embrassez-moi. ’ The young man leaned forward, and just touched one cheek with his lips. ‘ Eh bien ! eh bien ! est-ce ainsi qu'on embrasse quand on aime ? embrassez-moi sur les deux joues ! ’

He recommended a person present to pray for him, but added he : ‘ Que ce ne soit pas humainement. Demandez à ‘ Dieu qu'il me fasse beaucoup souffrir afin de me purifier avant ‘ ma mort. ’ ‘ Vous voulez donc, ’ replied his friend, ‘ entrer ‘ tout droit au ciel, M. le curé ? mais cela vous arrivera certainement. ’ ‘ Ah ! mon ami, ’ retorted the Abbé, ‘ non, cela ‘ ne m'arrivera pas. Je n'en suis pas digne, je ne pourrai pas ‘ éviter le purgatoire. ’

M. Thayer's chaplain having asked him his blessing upon a new branch-association of his *Archiconfrérie*, he answered, ‘ Priez, persévérez, et vous triompherez. La dévotion au saint ‘ et immaculé Cœur de Marie est le principe et le centre de ‘ toute dévotion. ’

On the 20th April he received extreme unction from his confessor, Father Soimier, and the viaticum from the Vicar-General and Archdeacon of Paris, the Abbé Baquet, and breathed his last at two o'clock in the morning of the 24th, in the eighty-second year of his age. He had been visited for the last time on the preceding evening by the Archbishop of Paris, who had found him still perfectly sensible, though unable to speak. During the three days that the *exposition du corps* lasted, tens of thousands of people went to the *chapelle ardente* to pay their respects to his memory. On the Sunday especially such numbers flocked to the building that persons had to wait a considerable time before being able to enter. The funeral took

place on the 30th April, in the presence of an immense crowd of persons, including the nuncio, the Bishop of Autun, most of the Paris curés, Montalembert, Veuillot, the Count of Brissac, Senator Thayer, and the Governor of the Bank of France. Mass was celebrated by the Vicar-General of the diocese, and the absolution given by the Archbishop, who delivered at the same time a funeral oration over his grave. By reason of the Abbé's great fame the corpse was, in conformity with the request of his parishioners, and with the Emperor's special permission, which was duly registered in the *Moniteur*, entombed in the church of Notre-Dame-des-Victoires, in a vault expressly prepared for it in front of the altar of the Chapel of the Blessed Virgin.

We now come to M. Desgenettes' literary productions. The *Œuvres inédites* before us consist of some hundred and forty-six discourses, reprinted from the author's own manuscripts, which, two years before his death, he entrusted, we presume, with a view to publication, to M. Desfossés, and of a few detached essays on various religious and theological subjects. Few of these discourses are, properly speaking, sermons; they form rather respectively, what are technically called *Instructions*, *Prônes*, *Conférences*, and so forth; and they range over the various topics usually treated of, too often with a good deal of monotonous sameness, in French pulpits, and suggested by the different Sundays and other festivals of the Christian year. They comprise, also, a series of lectures on the Decalogue, and a few panegyrics. Whatever may be the theological deficiencies or excrescences of some of M. Desgenettes' sermons, they are all most unexceptionable and orthodox in their divisions. Like all French compositions of that nature, properly so called, their different heads and divisions are carefully announced in the exordium, and elaborately and minutely traced out in the two *points* of which they consist. M. Desgenettes' discourses are plain, clear, unaffected, practical, affectionate, and well-adapted to the mixed nature of the congregations before which they were delivered.

'Tous le degrés de l'échelle sociale,' we are told, 'étaient représentés à l'auditoire de l'église de Notre-Dame-des-Victoires. Cet auditoire n'était pas composé exclusivement, comme on le voit pour certains prédicateurs, de telle ou telle classe de la société; mais c'était l'auditoire de toutes les classes indistinctement, comme était celui de Jésus-Christ et des Apôtres. Comme son divin Modèle, il entraînait les populations à sa suite. On voyait confondus, dans les vastes nefs de Notre-Dame-des-Victoires, l'homme d'épée et le magistrat, le riche négociant et le laborieux artisan, la dame richement mise et la pauvre ouvrière, le savant et l'ignorant, le prêtre et le fidèle. Chacun recevait avec avidité la parole du bon et éloquent pasteur, et tous s'en retournaient devenus meilleurs.'

As to what is here said about the Curé entraînant les populations à sa suite, and tous s'en retournant devenus meilleurs, there is something of the French love of exaggeration and hyperbole in the assertion ; but there is no doubt his discourses were well adapted to an auditory composed of so many different elements. If we fail to discover in them the depth of thought, the originality and comprehensiveness of view, the lofty flights of fancy, the variety of illustration, the power of argument, the forcible appeals to the feelings, the scrupulous elegance of diction, the brilliant thoughts expressed in brilliant language, the polish and the finish, and the impassioned bursts of eloquence, which characterize more or less the discourses of some of M. Desgenettes' contemporaries, living and dead, such as Frayssinous, Maccarthy, Ravignan, Lacordaire, Fayet, Combalot, Bautain, La Place, Felix, and others—they are at least free from the hardness and the dryness, the solemn and empty pretentiousness, the turgidity, the unreal conventionalisms, the clap-trap, the ostentatious and paltry artifices of composition, the abstract speculations, and the too frequently unintelligible transcendentalisms observable in some of the discourses of his countrymen. Some writers have spoken somewhat disparagingly of M. Desgenettes' discourses, whilst the ultramontanists generally have indulged in the most indiscriminating and unwarranted eulogiums on them, and regarded them as perfection. Both, it seems to us, are wrong. They are simply the discourses of an earnest, sensible, practical, reflecting, and experienced mind, well acquainted with human nature, and with the special wants of his people. His great object seems to have been to teach, reprove, rebuke, comfort, and exhort, and not to shine or dazzle. The preacher evidently spoke from the heart, as he evidently also, primarily and chiefly, appealed to the heart and consciences of his hearers. 'Si l'esprit a sa part, le cœur a la sienne plus grande encore et la conscience aussi,' is perfectly applicable to his discourses, which are marked by the earnestness and reality, the true sympathy with the trials and wants of others, the artless feeling and affectionate persuasiveness which thoroughly penetrated his nature, and the complete forgetfulness of self in the enunciation of the Divine Message, for which he was so pre-eminently distinguished ; and if his were not exactly the

'Thoughts that breathe, and words that burn,'

they were at least the

'Thoughts that rove about,

And loudly knock to have their passage out.'

Indeed, what the editors of Mr. Jay record of his preaching is not an inapt picture, *mutatis mutandis*, of M. Desgenettes him-

self: 'He spoke from his own nature to the nature of others. 'He was himself a most inartificial man. He knew human nature well. He studied it in himself and in others. He knew man, how he thinks, and feels, and acts. He drew his knowledge, not from copies and books, but from the living original. 'Men felt, when they heard him, that they were listening to a preacher who knew not only books, and theories, and systems, but humanity, both in its fallen and restored state: in its wants, woes, diseases, remedies, and varieties; one who could sympathise with them as well as teach them.'¹ These characteristics will probably account, to a great extent, for his popularity and efficiency as a preacher. Well has it been said: 'It is not the most intellectual ministry which is chiefly honoured of God, recommended, though it be, by all that is faithful in statement, and all that is attractive in style. It is the message of the man of prayer; of one who has been wrestling with God for a blessing beforehand; of one who looks upon the pulpit as such an "awful place," that, while there, he can forget self, forget reputation, forget everything, but the one solemn fact, that his words have immortality—made by no choice of power of his own—a savour of life unto life, or of death unto death.'²

Another noticeable feature in M. Desgenettes' sermons is his clearness of language and perspicuity of arrangement. We are told that the respected author took a great deal of pains in the composition of his sermons, and that he meditated long and anxiously what he wrote; and this we can believe. 'Pour bien écrire,' says Buffon, 'il faut posséder pleinement son sujet; il faut y réfléchir assez pour voir clairement l'ordre de ses pensées, et en former une suite, une chaîne continue, dont chaque point représente une idée; et lorsqu'on aura pris la plume, il faudra la conduire successivement sur ce premier trait, sans lui permettre de s'en écarter, sans l'appuyer trop inégalement, sans lui donner d'autre mouvement que celui qui sera déterminé par l'espace qu'elle doit parcourir.'³ Boileau also has remarked:—

'Avant d'écrire, apprenez à penser.

Selon que notre idée est plus ou moins obscure,

L'expression la suit, ou moins nette, ou plus pure.

Ce que l'on conçoit bien s'énonce clairement,

Et les mots pour le dire arrivent aisément.'⁴

M. Desgenettes seems to have followed these rules. His sermons are remarkable for the clear arrangement of the several parts, and the perspicuous distribution of the materials of which they are composed. He reflected well upon what he was going to say, and expressed his thoughts—and occasionally also, we

¹ *Autobiography*, p. 549.

² *Discours sur le Style*.

³ *Moore's Thoughts on Preaching*, p. 89.

⁴ *L'Art Poétique*, Chant III.

must add, the thoughts of others, as we shall see presently—in a plain, concise, and forcible way, without any sort of tinsel, pedantry, diffusiveness, vague generalities, or rhetorical embellishments. As has been said of Latimer, ‘a fresh and rough fragrance of nature hangs about him everywhere, impregnating and purifying with a rare and happy heartiness all his work.’ He never wanders out of his subject, and there is a great deal of reality in all he says: he always seems to speak because he has something to say; and if originality, richness, elegance, and comprehensiveness are not among the distinguishing features of his discourses, this is compensated by the definiteness, the earnestness, and well-sustained fervour which

‘Breathe throughout, and animate the whole.’

M. Desgenettes’ delivery was in character with the nature of his sermons, and his own. It was natural, unostentatious, impressive, destitute of every species of affectation and artificiality. He addressed his hearers, as a father would his children, with a dignified calmness, we might say a *bonhomie*, which, in another preacher, might have soon repelled a French audience, but which, in this ‘venerable ecclesiastic with long white hair,’ as Dr. Wordsworth describes him, were very appropriate and pleasing, and produced a good effect. In his later years he frequently sat down while delivering his sermon. He also stopped frequently, as has been already remarked, in the course of his discourse to take large pinches of snuff. He possessed in a high degree what M. Bautain calls a *voix sympathique*, which he defines as ‘a power of attraction which draws to it the hearer’s mind, and on its accents hangs its attention’—‘as a voice which inspires affection for him who speaks, and puts you instinctively on his side, so that its words find in your mind an echo which repeats there what is said, and reproduces it easily in the understanding and heart.’² We would not place the Curé of Notre-Dame-des-Victoires exactly on a par with the great Christian hero supposed to be represented in the life-like ‘Character of a Good Parson;’ nevertheless, on seeing the silver-haired and venerable old man, we have been more than once reminded of the celebrated portraiture:—

‘ Refined himself to soul, to curb the sense,
And made almost a sin of abstinence.
Yet had his aspect nothing of severe,
But such a face as promised him sincere.
Nothing reserved or sullen was to see,
But sweet regards and pleasing sanctity :
Mild was his accent and his action free.’

¹ Tullock’s *Leaders of the Reformation*, p. 305.

² *Etude sur l’Art de parler en public*, p. 89.

Au reste, if large congregations and sustained attention on their part are criterions of a preacher's attractiveness and usefulness, M. Desgenettes had every reason to be satisfied. De Villiers has said :—

‘Crois qu'un sermon est bon quand il est écouté.
Prêcher n'est pas savoir bien parler, bien écrire,
Mais se faire écouter en tout ce que l'on veut dire.
Par là se faire suivre, et qui n'a pas ce don,
Peut bien faire un discours, mais non pas un sermon ;’—¹

And this was the case with M. Desgenettes. We are told that people came from all parts of Paris to hear him, and that ‘aussitôt qu'il paraissait en chaire, le silence du désert se faisait. A l'attention pleine de sympathie et de contentement qui rayonnait sur tous les visages, on pouvait juger aussitôt de l'entraînement des cœurs.’

We will give one or two extracts from M. Desgenettes' works. The following argument on a subject which is now attracting a good deal of attention among ourselves is well put :—

‘D'impies et d'absurdes raisonneurs ont osé avancer que des miracles étaient impossibles, parce qu'ils étaient contraires aux lois éternelles, générales, établies pour le gouvernement et la conservation de l'univers, que Dieu, essentiellement ami de l'ordre, ne pouvait violer les règles éternelles de la nature. Quand les impies raisonnent ainsi, ils ne s'entendent plus eux-mêmes. La puissance de Dieu peut-elle avoir des bornes ? N'est-elle pas infinie ? Quelle est donc cette éternité dont on gratifie les lois qui régissent la nature ? N'ont-elles pas commencé et ne doivent-elles pas finir avec l'univers ? D'où viennent ces lois ? Qui les a faites ? Qui leur a donné une marche uniforme ? N'est-ce pas Dieu ? Et le Divin Architecte a-t-il voulu, a-t-il pu même enchaîner sa puissance, en soumettant sa volonté au joug d'une aveugle nécessité ? Non, Dieu, et Dieu seul, dispose en Maître souverain de la nature ; l'ordre physique est son ouvrage, et quand il y veut déroger, il est tout à fait dans l'ordre que cette dérogation se fasse, et dans ce cas les lois de la nature ne périssent point, mais sont seulement suspendues par quelques exceptions passagères.’—
Vol. i. pp. 249, 250.

The three sermons on our Lord's Passion, comprised in the works before us, contain some good and effective passages, and are among the most remarkable in the volumes. We had marked for extraction a passage from one of them, which, if not particularly distinguished for gracefulness, contains one or two striking thoughts forcibly expressed, and is not an inappropriate specimen of the Curé's ‘unadorned eloquence,’ but we have no space for it. We will, however, give an extract from one of the short disquisitions comprised in the fourth volume, and entitled *Raison et Mystères*. M. Desgenettes thus adjusts the respective positions, offices, and claims of reason and faith. He holds the

¹ *Art de prêcher. Chant III.*

balance far more evenly and justly than is usually done by ultramontanist writers :—

‘Si la raison doit se taire sur ce qui concerne le fond des mystères, dit l’incrédule, il faut donc croire sans raison : or, une croyance déstituée de raison est la croyance d’un imbécile. Raisonnement pitoyable ! Oui, la raison doit se taire sur le fond de nos mystères, et s’humilier devant leur profondeur ; mais il ne s’ensuit pas qu’on doive les croire sans raison. Distinguons les raisons de *crédulité* [*? crédibilité*] d’avec les raisons de *compréhensibilité* : elles ne sont point inséparables, puis qu’elles sont séparées de fait dans une infinité de circonstances. Et sans sortir du monde physique, combien d’effets dans la nature qui ont des raisons de crédibilité, parce qu’ils sont attestés par le témoignage constant et uniforme des sens, et qui cependant n’ont aucune raison de compréhensibilité, parce qu’ils ne peuvent être expliqués d’une manière satisfaisante pour l’esprit ? Or, il en est de même de nos mystères : quoique nous ne puissions les comprendre, nous avons cependant, à leur égard, les raisons de crédibilité les plus fortes et les plus victorieuses. Notre croyance n’est donc pas celle d’un imbécile, mais une croyance fondée en raison de croire.

‘Dieu, en imposant aux hommes le joug de la foi, n’a pas voulu anéantir la raison. Il a lié les vérités incompréhensibles aux hommes à des vérités dont ils peuvent s’instruire par les voies les plus connues. Ces vérités sont manifestées par des faits sur lesquels il n’y a point de dispute. Tels sont les miracles de Moïse, de Jésus-Christ, des Apôtres, des Martyrs et de toute l’Eglise, auxquels la religion chrétienne est attachée comme à ses preuves. On ne saurait contester ces faits sans combattre le sens commun, puisque les païens même, ne pouvant en nier l’évidence, se sont bornés pendant trois siècles à les attribuer à la magie. La vérité de la religion chrétienne, démontrée par les prodiges, emporte avec elle la vérité des mystères, quelque incompréhensibles qu’ils soient ; une vraie religion ne saurait enseigner l’erreur. “Jésus-Christ,” dit Saint Augustin, “a demandé la foi aux hommes, mais avant de la demander, il l’a méritée par les miracles.”’

‘N’admettre que la raison en matière de religion, c’est détruire la foi, dont le propre est de nous faire croire ce que nous ne comprenons pas. Ne rien accorder à la raison, c’est une autre extrémité. La vérité est au milieu. L’homme, en devenant chrétien, ne cesse pas d’être raisonnable. Comme il doit avoir des raisons de parler et d’agir, il doit avoir aussi des raisons de croire ; *rationabile obsequium*. Cette maxime regarde l’esprit, comme la volonté. La foi n’exclut donc point la raison, mais la suppose.

‘La foi, dit-on, est obscure : cela est vrai, mais cette obscurité ne regarde que son objet, et non pas le motif qui nous porte à y acquiescer. Je ne puis concevoir l’existence d’un Dieu en trois Personnes : ce dogme est obscur pour moi ; mais la raison me dit que je ne puis me refuser à la révélation qui l’enseigne, parce qu’elle conçoit que Dieu ne peut pas nous induire en erreur.

‘La foi, pourrait-on ajouter, est le sacrifice de la raison : oui, sans doute, puisqu’elle l’humilie, en l’obligeant de croire ce qu’elle ne peut comprendre ; mais c’est la raison elle-même qui exige de nous ce sacrifice, en nous en faisant sentir la nécessité.

‘La raison conduit l’homme à la foi, en lui découvrant la force des preuves de la religion : car la vraie religion connue le mène directement à la connaissance de ses mystères. Telle est donc la marche de l’esprit aidé et éclairé par le flambeau de la raison. La vraie religion, pense-t-il, ne peut induire en erreur ; une source pure ne produit point de ruisseaux impurs. Or, la religion chrétienne est la seule véritable ; ma raison ne peut résister à ses preuves, qui sont l’accomplissement des prophéties, les miracles de Jésus-Christ, sa résurrection, les progrès merveilleux de l’Evangile, la constance des

‘ Quid est fides, nisi credere quod non vides ?—S. August. *Tract. iv. in Joann.*

martyrs, la fécondité de l'Eglise au milieu des supplices, et autres : la religion chrétienne ne peut donc m'engager dans l'erreur. Or, elle me propose tels et tels dogmes ; c'est donc pour moi un devoir de les croire, quoique je ne puisse pas les comprendre. Ce raisonnement n'est point celui d'un superstitieux.

'Le chrétien, dans la religion, procède, suivant les règles de la dialectique la plus exacte, d'une vérité connue à d'autres qu'il ne connaissait pas, de la certitude des miracles à la vérité de la religion chrétienne, de celle-ci à la vérité des mystères qu'il ne comprend point. L'impie suit une méthode opposée : semblable à ces oiseaux nocturnes qui n'aiment que les ténèbres ; il part des points les plus obscurs pour attaquer les plus clairs, prétendant combattre, par ses mystères, une religion fondée sur des preuves aussi évidentes : il prouve, au contraire, qu'il est aussi mauvais philosophe que mauvais chrétien.—Vol. iv. p. 443—445.

In a short account of the Abbé Desgenettes' works and style of preaching, appended to the volumes before us, the publisher thinks it necessary specially to recommend them to the attention of French preachers, not only as models of pulpit eloquence, but also as well adapted to prove serviceable for another, and perhaps less unexceptionable, purpose. 'MM. les Ecclésiastiques,' says M. Levesque, with remarkable disinterestedness and naïveté, 'soit de la ville, soit de la campagne, ainsi que les Séminaires, trouveront dans ces œuvres un ample moisson d'instructions, de prênes et de sermons.' We have not the slightest doubt that Messieurs les Ecclésiastiques will find them a most convenient repertory, rich in all sorts of valuable material, for the object indicated by the very enterprising director of the *Librairie du sacré Cœur de Marie*, but it was hardly necessary to make a formal announcement to that effect. '*Vraiment, Monsieur, ce n'était pas la peine de le dire!*' French preachers, we know—acting, we presume, on Molière's convenient maxim, '*C'est mon bien, et je le prends partout où je le trouve,*' do not hesitate to extract largely from the labours of others—ay, and even occasionally to give them to the public as their own. Judging from the extent to which this habit prevails among French preachers¹ (and we might add French devotional and religious writers generally), we suppose the proceeding perfectly allowable; but we must confess that this appropriation of other men's thoughts and language is sometimes carried rather far; and in reading some of their sermons one not unfrequently stumbles upon a genuine piece from Bourdaloue, Bossuet, Lejeune, Cheminai, Fléchier, Mascaron, Texier, De la Rue, Neuville, Cambacérès, and other writers more or less known, to say nothing of the Fathers. Not only are the whole plan and scope of certain published sermons by different writers, treating of

¹ This is also a very common proceeding among Spanish and Italian preachers. Dr. Wolff tells us, for instance, that the famous description of Hell and Paradise given by Segneri is the very same as that which he once read in a Rabbinical book, and in a Surah of the Koran.—*Travels and Adventures*, last ed. p. 54.

the same subject, absolutely identical ; not only are the line of thought and general mode of treatment, the exordium, divisions, and peroration, very much the same ; but it sometimes happens also that there exists a very remarkable similarity in what may be called the minor accessories of the discourse and the working out of the details, the only apparent variety consisting in a few 'local tinges given to general thoughts' extracted from the writings of others, with the necessary amount of *remplissage*, and 'a dash of colour' thrown in here and there to disguise the plagiarism, or to adapt the sermon to the peculiar circumstances of its hearers ;—nay, we have sometimes met with whole passages, carefully selected from the works of the preachers of former times, and incorporated, without the slightest acknowledgment or remorse, into professed original compositions ! If such discourses cannot be regarded as perfect models of conception and invention, and if it cannot be predicated of them, to use an expression of the French Academy, that they 'confer the highest honour on human intellect,' to their authors must at least be conceded the merit of a practical and discriminating acquaintance with their predecessors' labours.

This characteristic of many modern French sermons is observable in many parts of the four volumes before us. We do not profess to have minutely and thoroughly examined the whole of M. Desgenettes' discourses ; nevertheless, cursory as our perusal has been, we have read enough to see that he is often greatly indebted to some of the preachers that have preceded him. We do not know what the extent of his reading may have been in other directions : the administration of his immense parish, and the many works of charity he organized and directed, and which absorbed so considerable a portion of his time, doubtless prevented his devoting much time to theological study ; but his sermons seem at any rate to afford unequivocal evidence that he was well versed in the writings of the great preachers of a former period among his countrymen. We have not only noticed many a passage which is a mere elaboration and development of some idea from Bourdaloue and Massillon, but in some instances the respected author has not scrupled to appropriate their very language, and to interweave, with what we take to be his own compositions, lengthy and well-known paragraphs from their writings. We repeat it, from the frequency and coolness with which this is done, we must suppose that French publishers of sermons generally, and the late Curé of Notre-Dame-des-Victoires in particular, have habitually regarded such a proceeding as perfectly legitimate ; and the more so in the latter case, as in the good Abbé's five lectures on the seventh of the Commandments, as rearranged by the Roman Church, there is no reference

whatever to literary pilfering; but we must say we never expected to find the process carried to such an extent in anybody's *œuvres inédites*! For instance, the whole of the five, and somewhat closely printed, pages comprising the *second point* of the Abbé's second sermon *Sur le Salut*, with the exception of a few slight omissions and additions, are a simple and literal reproduction of a short dissertation to be found among Bourdaloue's *Opuscules*, and entitled, *Petit nombre des élus; de quelle manière il faut l'entendre; et le fruit qu'on peut retirer de cette considération*. The Abbé might as well have transcribed, preached, and published as his own the well-known conclusion of S. Vincent de Paul's sermon, *pour l'Œuvre des Enfants trouvés*, Bossuet's celebrated passage on Cromwell, in his *Oraison funèbre de Henriette-Marie de France*, or that on the eloquence of S. Paul in his panegyric on that Apostle, Massillon's sermon on the *Petit nombre des élus*, or Bourdaloue's own *Puissance de Jésus-Christ dans sa Passion*, forming the first division of his Sermon for Good Friday, as transcribe, preach, and leave for publication, as his own, the passage before us. We will place side by side an extract from Bourdaloue and one from Desgenettes. They will serve as an excellent specimen of what sometimes passes in France as *œuvres inédites*, and illustrate at the same time the remarkable progress made in the art of grammar generally, and punctuation in particular, as well as in the science of theology, since the time of Bourdaloue.

BOURDALOUE.

‘Quoiqu’il en soit, tout auditeur sage et chrétien profitera de cette pensée du petit nombre des élus, et, saisi d’une juste frayeur, il apprendra : 1^o, à redoubler sa vigilance, et à se prémunir plus que jamais contre tous les dangers où peut l’exposer le commerce de la vie ; 2^o, à ne pas demeurer un seul jour dans l’état de péché mortel, s’il lui arrive quelquefois d’y tomber, mais à courir incessamment au remède et à se relever par un prompt retour ; 3^o, à se séparer de la multitude, et par conséquent du monde, à s’en séparer, dis-je, sinon d’effet, car tous ne le peuvent pas, au moins d’esprit, de cœur, de maximes, de sentiments, de pratiques ; 4^o, à suivre le petit nombre des chrétiens vraiment chrétiens, c’est-à-dire des chrétiens réglés dans toute leur conduite, fidèles à tous leurs devoirs, assidus au service de Dieu, charitables envers le prochain,

DESGENETTES.

‘Nous devons tous profiter de cette pensée du petit nombre des élus, et, saisi d’une juste frayeur, nous apprendrons premièrement à redoubler notre vigilance et à nous prémunir plus que jamais contre tous les dangers où peut nous exposer le commerce de la vie. En second lieu, à ne pas demeurer un seul jour dans l’état *de* [sic] péché mortel, s’il arrive par malheur d’y tomber ; mais à courir incessamment au remède, pour être relevés par un prompt retour. En troisième lieu, à nous séparer de la multitude, et par conséquent du monde, à nous en séparer sinon d’effet (car tous ne le peuvent pas), et au moins [sic] d’esprit, de cœur, de maximes, de sentiments, de conduite. En quatrième lieu, à suivre le petit nombre des chrétiens, vraiment chrétiens ; c’est-à-dire des chrétiens réglés dans toute leur vie, fidèles à tous leurs devoirs, assidus au

BOURDALOUE.

soigneux de se perfectionner et de s'avancer par un continuel exercice des vertus, dégagés de tout intérêt humain, de toute ambition, de toute attachement profane, de tout ressentiment, de toute fraude, de toute injustice, de tout ce qui peut blesser la conscience et la corrompre ; 5°, à prendre résolument et généreusement la voie étroite, puisque c'est l'unique voie que Jésus-Christ est venu nous enseigner ; à s'efforcer, selon la parole du même Sauveur, et à se roidir contre tous les obstacles, soit du dedans, soit du dehors, contre le penchant de la nature, contre l'empire des sens, contre le torrent de la coutume, contre l'attrait des compagnies, contre les impressions de l'exemple, contre les discours et le jugements du public, n'ayant en vue que de se sauver, ne voulant que cela, ne cherchant que cela, n'étant en peine que de cela ; 6°, enfin, à réclamer sans cesse la grâce du ciel, à recommander sans cesse son âme à Dieu, et à lui faire chaque jour l'excellente prière de Salomon : *Dieu de miséricorde, Seigneur, donnez-moi la vraie sagesse qui est la science du salut, et ne me rejetez jamais du nombre de vos enfants* (Sap. ix), qui sont vos élus, &c., &c.'—*Œuvres complètes*, vol. iii. p. 333. Paris : 1840, ed. Didot.

DESGENETTES.

service de Dieu, charitables envers le prochain, soigneux de se perfectionner et de s'avancer par un continuel exercice des vertus de leur état ; dégagés de tout intérêt humain, de toute ambition, de tout attachement profane, de tout ressentiment, de toute fraude, de toute dissimulation, de toute injustice, en un mot, de tout ce qui peut blesser la conscience et la corrompre. Enfin, à prendre résolument et généreusement la voie étroite, puisque c'est l'unique voie que Jésus-Christ est venu nous enseigner, à s'efforcer et à se roidir contre tous les obstacles, soit du dedans, soit du dehors, contre le penchant de la nature corrompue, contre l'empire des sens, contre le torrent de la coutume, contre l'attrait des compagnies dangereuses et du respect humain, contre les impressions du mauvais exemple, contre les discours et les jugements du public ; n'ayant en vue que de nous sauver, ne voulant que cela, ne cherchant que cela, n'étant en peine que de cela.

'Ajoutons encore, à réclamer sans cesse la grâce du ciel, à recommander sans cesse notre âme à Dieu, à la sainte Vierge, à nos Anges tutélaires, à nos saints Patrons et à tous les Saints, dont chaque année on célèbre la mémoire ; à faire à Dieu chaque jour cette excellente prière de Salomon : O Dieu de miséricorde, Seigneur, donnez-moi la vraie sagesse, qui est la science du salut, et ne me rejetez jamais du nombre de vos enfants, qui sont vos élus, &c., &c.'—*Œuvres inédites*, vol. iii. pp. 173, 174.

Should another edition of these volumes be called for, which will doubtless be the case—especially if the publisher's hint be taken by 'Messieurs les ecclésiastiques'—we trust M. Desfossés will incorporate into the work some of the Abbé Desgenettes' correspondence, which was very varied and extensive, and which would prove interesting to a large class of readers. We trust, also, he will subject the whole work to a careful and thorough revision. The volumes before us abound in errors—we know not whether to regard them as misprints or blunders—which sadly disfigure them. We have stumbled upon many instances of bad grammar, both in the *Notice Biographique* and in the works ; the punctuation particularly, which we have taken the

liberty to rectify in some of the extracts we have given, is wretched throughout. In several places also words seem to have been omitted. Neither do we like the expression 'prêtre jureur,' which the biographer uses occasionally—it is not only very *familière*, but also equivocal; and 'prêtre assermenté' is better in every way. As regards the style and the arrangement of the materials, it is an ill-written and somewhat confused piece of biography, which seems to have been hurriedly put together, though it is the best account we have of M. Desgenettes. In other respects we do not wish to find fault with the *Notice Biographique*, which, on the whole, seems to contain a faithful and unvarnished account of the late Curé of Notre-Dame-des-Victoires, and is much freer from inflated and meaningless panegyric than we expected, though, of course, the biographer uses at times the superlative degree where the positive would have done just as well, and some of his statements must be received *cum grano*. There are, moreover, a few points connected with M. Desgenettes' life on which we should have desired further enlightenment. With reference to any future edition of M. Desgenettes' works that may appear, we would not take upon ourselves to advise his present editor to perform for them the same kind of office which the accomplished editor of Bourdaloue, Cheminai, and Giroust, did for theirs, namely, to *retoucher* his sermons, though they are in great want of something of the sort. Should M. Desfossés venture upon the task, we doubt whether his editorial achievements would exactly deserve the eulogy which the Père De La Rue bestowed upon those of the Père Bretonneau, when he designated him, in the language which the Roman Church applies to S. Martin, as *trium mortuorum suscitator magnificus*. To retrench, on the other hand, any passages, would perhaps be a questionable piece of interference; possibly, however, the editor might point out how much the preacher was indebted to his predecessors. The task might prove an arduous one; but it would at least enable us to know, without, we believe, greatly detracting from the worthy Curé's fame, what is, and what is not M. Desgenettes', and prove an additional recommendation to his volumes.

ART. VII.—*On the Study of the Evidences of Christianity.* By
BADEN POWELL, M.A. F.R.S. &c. &c. Savilian Professor of
Geometry in the University of Oxford.

WE did not anticipate that any great amount of evil would arise from the publication of the volume of 'Essays and Reviews,' which has now for some months been the all absorbing topic of conversation in literary circles. We will not arrogate to ourselves the prophetic power of predicting that the actual results which it has produced have been exactly what might have been expected. In point of fact, we scarcely expected so public, so distinct and unequivocal, so unanimous a condemnation as has been passed upon it by the learned and the vulgar alike. It is of no use for the Essayists and their few adherents to disguise the fact that all the good and the great in the Church of England have pronounced sentence against them; that nearly every one competent to form an opinion has decided that their views are irreconcilably opposed to the dogmatic teaching of the Church of England; that the clergy, with a unanimity entirely unparalleled, have concurred in expressing their dissent from them, and that the laity have expressed more alarm at their denial of the faith than they have ever before done, at any, whether real or supposed, insincerity in their teachers. The writers have discovered that they have made a false move, that they have damaged the progress of Rationalism, within the pale of the Church of England, more than the youngest of their number can hope to see repaired even if he should live to extreme old age. The 'free-handling' for which, upon their own showing, the authors are responsible, has proved to be a mistake. Their friends are filled with dismay at the want of caution betrayed in speaking out so prematurely, and those from whom they had a right to expect countenance and support have, with scarcely an exception, joined the ranks of their opponents, and are careful to express their abhorrence of views which are only a little in advance of those which they have themselves advocated. The reaction which has set in since 1845, and has held a steady course from the publication of No. 90 of the 'Tracts for the Times,' has been abruptly checked, and dogmatic theology seems destined again to have a hearing.

Amidst, however, much reason for rejoicing at the storm of indignation which the publication of the volume has raised, there is no doubt reason, also, for fear that it will have contributed much to the unsettling of the faith of many. Infidel publica-

tions, however feeble their arguments may be, and however stale their objections to Christianity, will always find some readers who will be dazzled by their plausible show of reason, and who will be carried away by the apparent novelty of their assertions; and it is hopeless to expect that even this volume, ridiculous as are its pretensions to learning and logic, will entirely fail to shake the faith of weak and vacillating Christians. We have had little means of judging of its effects in this direction, whilst the results in the opposite direction have been most palpable and unmistakeable. Few, perhaps, will hear of the individuals whose faith may have been undermined by suggestions first met with in these pages; but no one can have witnessed the religious panic of the last six months without being aware that persons amongst whom the Essayists must naturally have expected supporters and abettors are amongst the foremost to condemn them. The party in the Church, which may in the main be represented by the *Christian Remembrancer*, was first in the field. The Evangelical party, through the *Christian Observer*, if they were unable to expose the fallacies, were at least honest enough to protest against the conclusions of the Essayists; and popular indignation, now that it has expressed itself in unequivocal language, has carried in its train nearly all the leaders of the Latitudinarian party, who, up to the time of the publication of the volume, had been actively engaged in preparing the way for its reception.

One bishop has been found, in the zeal of private friendship, chivalrous enough to hazard a few faltering appeals in deprecation of extreme measures being adopted. One writer, who, however, is anonymous, has ventured to put out a pamphlet of orthodox extracts from Mr. Jowett's writings, with the view, we presume, of throwing dust in people's eyes, and not, surely, with any persuasion that the effect of false statements can in any degree be done away with by any amount of assertions that are true. Meanwhile, an effort in the same direction is being made by the publication of a volume of sermons by the Head Master of Rugby, which will probably be in the hands of some of our readers before what we are now writing is in type.¹ We confess we have no curiosity to see this

¹ Since writing the above we have seen the volume of Sermons, which the author informs us in his preface are printed exactly as they were preached. We see no reason for any apology on the score of 'blemishes of style' or omitted links of argument. We do not suppose that if they had been published under any circumstances, they would have been subjected to much alteration. Among the various reasons why the author thought proper to print them exactly as they were preached, of course the prominent one is that people may see that Dr. Temple has not altered them with reference to the present case. There is little that need be said about them, but that they are about equal to the average of school sermons,

volumes. We know exactly the mould in which it will be cast. There will not be a word in it which will offend popular prejudices. It will not contain anything that is deep. It will be orthodox enough to satisfy any ordinary reader, and a few of the unlearned fathers and mothers who have sent their sons to Rugby will see in it a triumphant refutation of the unjust charges that have been made against Dr. Temple. Not so the class of people who are able to judge, and in this case the class will be a large one. The question with regard to both these writers will be, not What have they said that is true, and good, and beautiful? nor again, What is the character which they bear for purity of life and conscientiousness of action? People will see that it is entirely beside the momentous point at issue to examine what they have said on other occasions, except so far as it may explain doubtful and obscure allusions in this volume; or except, in any subsequent publication, they have retracted their errors and expressed regret for what they have written. After all that may be said or written upon the subject, it will be impossible to prevent the issue coming to these two questions in the mind of any fair and competent judge. Is it true or not that the Essayists have published a volume entirely subversive of the idea of Christianity commonly received in this country? And secondly will come a question of morality. Whether these views be in themselves true or false, are they consistent with the solemn profession of acknowledgment of, and hearty assent to the formularies of, the Church of England? Let the Essayists do what they will, and let their positions be impugned and defended to whatever extent they may, we say that it will be impossible to avoid this issue; and whatever may be the result of legal proceedings against individuals of their number, we are certain what will be the opinion of all persons of common honesty who are capable of forming a judgment upon the matter. With regard to replies which have been appearing in rapid succession, and which will, no doubt, continue to appear for some months yet, till this extraordinary excitement has somewhat subsided, we confess that we do not expect that they will do much good. For the most part they will of course be hasty and ill-considered productions. In these days when every body writes, so many will be found who have something to say upon some of the subjects controverted in these Essays, that we shall not be surprised if there is an average of a pamphlet to every page of the volume. And even where there is a solid

and that they are of very different degrees of strength. The eighteenth Sermon, on Confession, perhaps shows the greatest amount of inability to understand those who differ from the writer's view, as the assertion made at the beginning of it indicates an astounding ignorance as to the facts of the case.

answer given to any of the sceptical assertions or insinuations contained in the work, there will still remain the objection that the great mass of misstatements and errors remain just where they were; for, in point of fact, there is no single doctrine of the Christian faith that is not directly, or by implication, attacked in this publication. And here, before we enter upon the particular subject of this article, we may be permitted to add a few words as to this point which has been urged again and again by those who have not read the volume, and who have only become acquainted with it by means of the extraordinary commotion which it has caused. We have heard it alleged, and the allegation has certainly a show of truth, that the best way to silence these men is to answer them. No sensible person who has read the book would, we are persuaded, be guilty of the absurdity of making this suggestion; but as we may suppose that some even of the readers of the *Christian Remembrancer* will not have read it, we must beg their indulgence, whilst we explain the impossibility of giving any complete, concise, and readable answer to such a tissue of arrogant assertions and unproved conclusions. To make what we have to say clear, we will make an extreme supposition. Suppose, then, a set of writers, with the view of setting aside the theory of moral obligation, in the general, or any particular form of it, had, in the course of their argument, taken it for granted that there was, of course, no supreme Creator of the Universe, no Being to whom the homage of mankind was due on the score of creation, preservation, redemption, or any other blessings, temporal or spiritual; suppose, moreover, that they had implied that this belief was now an exploded theory, or, if believed at all, certainly entitled to no credit, and not possessing any adherents among those who were learned and competent judges. Suppose that instead of attempting to prove that there was no God, they had assumed this as an axiomatic truth in the new theory of religion, and had interspersed their assertions with frequent sneers at the bigotry and intolerance of those who follow the current belief, and who are shocked at hearing it impugned, what course would the Christian world have adopted with regard to their notice of such a volume? For ourselves, we must give it as our opinion that such a work would have passed unnoticed, if it had come from the pen of writers who were known to be sceptics or atheists; and in the almost inconceivable case of such a work being published by professed believers in Christianity, most people would probably be satisfied with the denunciation of the writers for their hypocrisy in holding such inconsistent views, and for their fraud in endeavouring to persuade people that such views were commonly held. To continue. Suppose that it were resolved that such a volume

should not pass unnoticed, let us consider what course would have to be adopted. In the first place it would be necessary to attack the main purpose of the book, viz. under the present supposition the attempt to gainsay some principle of moral obligation. It would be necessary to exhibit the grounds upon which such principle stands, and it would be indispensable for the writer to expose the fallacy of the arguments adduced in disproof of it. When it is remembered how easy it is for a fool to raise objections which it may be extremely difficult for even a wise man to answer—it will not be thought surprising if the reply should occupy considerably more space than the attack. But in this case, the reply to the main argument of the volume would, in reality, be an insignificant portion of the refutation that would be required. There would still remain to be noticed every inuendo which suggested a state of belief which did not correspond to fact; and amongst other arguments, a whole treatise on natural theology would have to be written to answer objections to the doctrine of the existence of One Supreme Deity, which, differing in form from the often made, and as often answered, allegations on this subject, might require an answer couched under some variety of expression. If the writers in the course of their crude and ill-digested theories, had thrown out insinuations against other long believed and deeply cherished truths, the task of replying to them would be rendered still more difficult and complicated; and it is obvious that the final result would utterly fail of undoing the whole damage caused by the volume in question. It is certain that there would at the last remain many who could well understand the attack, but who would be far from appreciating the defence, and many more who would probably be quite able to estimate the case, but who would not take the trouble to master it, and who would be left in the unfortunate predicament of having doubts and difficulties suggested to their minds, the influence of which, in the absence of any solution to counteract them, would tell with damaging effect upon their life and conduct.

It is scarcely necessary to say that the supposition we have been making does not in any exact way represent the case of the Seven Essayists. As far as the results are concerned to certain individuals, as well as the difficulty of condensing a reply into any readable compass, the cases are exactly similar. The supposition we have made for the sake of representing the argument in a clearer light, as to the main purpose of the volume, does not correspond exactly with the state of the present case. The writers have not had it in view to attack directly any point of morality, but only to exhibit the advantage derivable generally to religion and morality, from a system of 'free-handling'

which seems to mean reckless putting out of superficial and ill-digested thoughts upon the most sacred subjects, in defiance of all the prejudices of ordinary Christians. Neither must we be led away into the error of supposing that what is the object of one Essay only, viz. Mr. Wilson's, is the object of the volume.

The writers, as a body, may certainly be acquitted of the charge of intending to show the honesty of asserting that you believe what you do not believe, which is the direct and only object of the Essay on the National Church. To uphold dishonesty is the purpose of this Essay, we repeat, but not the intention of the volume; though, in point of fact, we cannot see how the writers can be cleared of the charge of dishonesty, whilst they retain their positions in the Church. Again, there is another point in which the case we have been supposing does not exactly resemble that of the Essayists. They have not, as a body, thrown out insinuations against the Unity and Personality of the Divine Being. This may be thought to be the object of one of the Essays; but whatever there may be in this one Essay to countenance so grave a charge, it would be absurd to suppose that the Essayists, as a body, disbelieve in this fundamental truth of natural theology. The 'free-handling' has, in a single instance, led a writer into statements which amount to Pantheism, yet even he shrinks from avowing the conclusion of his own premises; and the other writers are entirely free from even the appearance of adopting so absurd a theory. With regard to the taking for granted that certain things, quite commonly believed amongst us, are now exploded by the learned, there is no difference between the case we have been supposing and the case now before us. Such, for instance, is the twice repeated insinuation that the Second General Epistle of S. Peter is a forgery, and, as such, not entitled to occupy a place in the Canon of Scripture. Now here is an insinuation twice made, and asserted, as it were indirectly and casually, without the faintest shadow of evidence brought forward to prove it. And this will serve to illustrate the mischievous nature of the volume. To do away with the effects of the few lines in which this assertion is made it would be requisite to write a treatise first to show that people in general, both learned and unlearned, are, in fact, agreed in accepting this epistle; and, secondly, to give all the evidence, internal as well as external, which would suffice to satisfy a fair mind of the falsity of the allegation implied in the expression, 'the genuine Epistle of Peter.'

It is our purpose in this paper to exhibit the whole amount of unproved statement in the late Professor Powell's Essay.

But before we proceed further, it may be worth while to

notice the only considerable defence that has been set up for the volume generally. It was, for a long time, scarcely understood why the two *Quarterly* Reviews, that have maintained their place the longest, and, perhaps, have still the widest circulation, preserved so entire a silence on what was occupying the minds of, at least, a very large section of the intellectual public. The volume had been out for nearly a year before the celebrated article in the *Quarterly* appeared, and more than a year when the counterblast came from the *Edinburgh*. The former of these articles appears to us, like almost every other article which we have met with, to have been fairly and temperately written. In one or two instances, it may, perhaps, have misrepresented the Essayists and Reviewers; but, upon the whole, it fairly represented the tone of the volume, and the relation in which it stood to Christianity. Its popularity is, perhaps, owing more to the wide circulation of the *Quarterly* than to its intrinsic merits. However, without stopping to discuss the merits of the case, it is certain that this article has been the main cause of the immense increase of the circulation of the volume reviewed, as well as of the number of the periodical in which it was reviewed. And as the *Quarterly* commends itself to the mass of its readers as being safe in religious matters, rather representing an antagonism to the High Church party, as well as to the Latitudinarian and the Puritan parties, it is not surprising that an article which first made known to the public at large the startling contents of a volume hitherto hardly known by name, should have propagated itself as it has done, and spread through the country in the shape of four editions of the January number of the *Quarterly*. One of the Essayists had died; one was a layman, and was entitled to hold and teach what he pleased without incurring the scandal which attached to clergy who had betrayed the faith they were pledged to maintain. The rest were in imminent danger. Whatever might be the result of legal measures adopted against them or their opinions, their influence was almost irretrievably ruined. Two of them, though by no means the most plain-spoken of the number, occupied positions of conspicuous eminence, as well as of considerable influence. It was worth while, for the sake of the party generally, to make an effort to preserve the reputations of Dr. Temple and Mr. Jowett. Unless something was done, and that speedily, the numbers at Rugby would soon begin to diminish, and the students at Balliol to look shy upon the Regius Professor of Greek; and the result has been that one, whose interest it is to defend the tenableness of their position, but who does not care to endorse their opinions or commit himself to their views, has prevailed upon the *Edinburgh* to throw its shield over the unfortunate seven champions of hear-

thendom. No doubt it is a great advantage. It was the best move on the board. If the game was to be retrieved, it could only be done by enlisting on the side of the sceptics the political and religious parties represented by the *Edinburgh*, and the issue remains to be seen. Meanwhile, we may be allowed to express our surprise and our sorrow that the *Edinburgh Review* has lent itself to such a purpose. Still more must we regret the unscrupulous style in which the defence has been got up. We have called it a counterblast. It exactly represents the state of the case. The purpose of the writer is to destroy the influence of the notices of the volume published in the *Quarterly* at the commencement of this year, and the *Westminster* of last October, and then to represent the manifesto of the archbishops and bishops, and the expressed opinions of the clergy, whether in convocation or petitions, as entitled to no weight. With regard to these points, we have seldom seen in any review more wanton or more silly misrepresentations than this article contains. In order to disparage the enormous influence which the writer in the *Quarterly* has exercised on the present state of public opinion, it was found convenient, and that in the face of the plainest facts, which contradict the hypothesis, to attribute the origin of the movement to the previous notice of the volume in the *Westminster Review*, and then to characterise this latter notice as full of presumptuous ignorance, unscrupulous misrepresentation, and malignant insinuation; at the same time that the writer was denounced as 'one who combined with a profound ignorance of nearly all that had been written on the questions at issue an almost fanatical desire to inveigle those who stood on more secure positions to the narrow ledge of the precipice, on the midway of which he was himself standing.' And though almost every weekly, monthly, and quarterly periodical had noticed and condemned this volume, either previously to or simultaneously with the appearance of the 'Westminster manifesto,' the partisans of the two chief schools (we suppose the writer means the schools represented by the *Christian Remembrancer* and the *Christian Observer* respectively), are represented as catching up and eagerly echoing the note of the infidel journal. A writer who so freely accuses others of unscrupulous misrepresentation should himself have been more careful of his assertions.

It is not likely that people will believe, on the mere authority of an anonymous writer in the *Edinburgh*, that preachers read up the *Quarterly* on Saturday, and on the next morning denounced the writers from the pulpit as Atheists: and those who can recollect the quarrels of twenty-five years past will form their own opinion as to whether or not a black stain was left on the reputation of the writer by the celebrated 'Elucidations of

Dr. Hampden's Theological Statements.' It is not worth our while to follow this writer further. It would, however, be doing him injustice if we did not say that we think he has admirably played the part of counsel for the defence. He has raked up everything that could tell for his clients, and that could damage the opposite party; and where he was unable to make any case, as in the instance of Professor Powell's Essay, he has skilfully evaded the difficulty on the ground that its author has passed beyond the reach of literary criticism and ecclesiastical censure.

We shall dismiss it with the remark, that the writer in the *Edinburgh Review* seems to have undertaken not the cause of the Essayists in general, whom he is content to throw overboard, if only he can save the first and the last of the seven writers, Dr. Temple and Mr. Jowett.

Before, however, we show up Professor Powell's rash assertions and sceptical conclusions, it may be worth while to give a few short extracts in proof of his orthodoxy, simply premising that, in our view, such evidence amounts to exactly as much as the defence which is said to have puzzled a jury so much in a celebrated case where seven persons were found to swear that they had witnessed a certain crime committed, and seven others declared that they had not seen it. Perhaps our extracts may save us from the imputation of wilfully withholding what may be said in the author's favour; and perhaps some of our readers who think they are not sufficient to counterbalance the heterodox opinions of the rest of the Essay, will apply the same argument to the case of Professor Jowett's Essay, and the 'Statements of Christian Doctrine and Practice,' extracted from the published writings of Professor Jowett.

In the Essay, then, on the study of the evidences of Christianity, the author professes to believe that 'the essential doctrines of Christianity are the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever;' that 'objections are often urged in a manner and tone offensive to religious feeling and conscientious prepossessions which are entitled to respectful consideration.' That 'the early apologists were rather defenders of the Christian cause generally; but when they entered on evidential topics, naturally did so rather in accordance with the prevalent mode of thought, than with what would now be deemed a philosophical investigation of alleged facts, and critical appreciation of testimony in support of them.' Again:—'The argument from necessity of miracles is at best a very hazardous one, since it implies the presumption of constituting ourselves judges of such necessity, and admits the fair objection, when were miracles more needed than at the present day, to indicate

'the truth amid manifold error, or to propagate the faith?' Again:—'All reason and science conspire to the confession that beyond the domain of physical causation and the possible conceptions of *intellect* or *knowledge*, there lies open the boundless region of spiritual things which is the sole dominion of *faith*.'

The last quotation we will make shall be the concluding paragraph of the essay. 'The reason of the hope that is in us is not restricted to external signs, nor to any one kind of evidence, but consists of such assurance as may be most satisfactory to each earnest individual inquirer's own mind. And the true acceptance of the entire revealed manifestation of Christianity will be most worthily and satisfactorily based on that assurance of faith by which the apostle affirms we stand (2 Cor. ii. 24); and which, in accordance with his emphatic declaration, must rest, not in the wisdom of man, but in the power of God' (1 Cor. ii. 5). And now, before we proceed, let us entreat our readers to pause a moment, and to endeavour to bear in mind that a number of true statements produced from the works of a given historian are no sort of evidence as to his accuracy and truthfulness in the general, because there never was a book professing to be history written which did not contain a much larger amount of truth than of falsehood: let it also be remembered that the same holds still more strongly in a work of science. The most erroneous theory that ever was broached will admit of extracts being made from the work which contains its exposition, which may appear not only harmless and true but even of value and importance. Neither do we see why an Essay which may be considered partly historical, partly scientific, should be regarded as exempt from the same law. It will be understood, then, that the passages we have quoted have not been extracted from the volume before us with any object of contrasting them with others which will be produced in the sequel, but rather that the author may have the benefit of being judged by the reader according to them; for, certainly, they do appear to indicate an undoubting belief in a Christianity of some kind. We believe none of the author's own immediate friends profess to be able to comprehend how the Professor's view of the absolute immutability of the laws of nature as established already, or to be established hereafter by induction, is to be reconciled with the supernatural aspects of Revelation and Christianity.

The *πρῶτον ψεῦδος* of the Essay undoubtedly is this: that the regions of the spiritual and the physical are entirely distinct; that faith has its province in the former, science its dominion in the other.

That the ideas of 'the physical' and 'the spiritual' are in themselves abstractedly entirely distinct, is plain enough. That

mind and matter are distinct is a truth which is either identical with the above, or, at least, very nearly coincident with it. This cannot be denied; but then no thoughtful person will deny that the reciprocal influences of the physical and spiritual, the action of matter upon mind and the influence of mind over matter, are amongst the earliest and most familiar ideas we are conversant with; and, undoubtedly, the form of Christianity to which we have been accustomed seems to recognise some very intimate relations between them. We are not combating the position of our author, but only illustrating our own meaning, when we refer to the doctrine of sacramental grace, as implying very definite and very mysterious relations between the physical and the spiritual world. In what sense the Essay about which we are treating implies, in some parts of it, a belief in these things, we need not inquire.

That all such belief must be given up before the reader can adopt the Essay as a whole, will appear plainly enough in the sequel, because these are only particular instances of effects which will not fit in to natural causes, and which must therefore be discarded as not amenable to the tests of induction. But this distinction between the worlds of faith and of reason, enables the author, as he thinks, to accept Christianity as a matter of faith, at the same time that he takes exception to all the ordinarily received credentials of Christianity, and especially to the miracles to which it appeals as one part of those credentials. That the value of miracles has been overrated, and that especially when the argument has been isolated from the other evidences of Christianity, we most fully admit. We do not indeed doubt that the effect of the cumulative argument, from external and internal evidence, from prophecy and miracle combined, its adaptation to the necessities of human nature, and the like, have been often pressed much too far, as if they contained a sort of mathematical demonstration from which it was impossible to escape. The necessity of a willing mind and a tractable disposition, seems, in the course of these arguments, to have been much lost sight of, whereas this is in fact the only key by which in most cases the resistance to such strong evidence can be accounted for. Yet, though miracles must not be made too much of, as if they were adequate to an effect which God has made to rest upon several independent witnesses; and though it is perhaps conceivable that Christianity might have been propagated without any distinctly miraculous interference; and though it were admitted that all other alleged miracles could be explained, or were likely some day to be explained, as instances of higher laws of the physical world, beyond our present inductions, but which were hereafter to be established as laws of nature, it

must not be forgotten that Christianity has, so to say, staked its credit on one particular miraculous fact. The Apostles were witnesses of the Resurrection. This they professed themselves to be, and specially appointed one in addition to their number of eleven, for the express purpose of bearing witness to the same fact; and nothing can be plainer than S. Paul's asseveration that Christianity is a mere fiction if the Resurrection is not a fact. Now, the main position which the late Professor Powell assumes, and in defence of which he thought it sufficient to urge the distinction between the ideas of mind and of matter, the absolute independence of the material and the spiritual worlds, is, that a miracle in the physical world is impossible. Now, we are not going to accuse the writer of actual disbelief in Christianity. Nothing would be gained to our argument, which is only concerned with his Essay, if it could be proved that he was a mere unbeliever.

A man's mind may be so singularly constituted that, professing an unhesitating belief in some elementary truth of geometry, he shall yet deny that which follows from it as a necessary and immediate consequence. We may express our wonder at the fact, which, in a psychological point of view, may be of the highest interest and importance; but in dealing with the truths of the case, we may be content to show that no *reasonable* person can consistently hold the one truth without holding the other also; and the method of doing so would of course be to prove the one from the other. Let, then, Professor Powell's idiosyncrasy have all the benefit that can possibly be allowed it; but let us not be called uncharitable if we show that, upon his own argument, the Essayist ought to be an unbeliever. We will pass by the fact that he who professes a belief in a Christianity without miracles, professes a belief in an entirely different thing from what is ordinarily understood by the term Christianity, because certain miracles, as such, are an essential part of the working of Christianity. We are only going now to consider that cardinal miraculous fact on which, as we have said, the credit of Christianity is staked, and by which it must stand or fall. Well, then, he who professes to receive Christianity, and disbelieves in the possibility of miracles, must adopt one of two courses with regard to the fact of the Resurrection of our blessed Lord from the grave. Either he must deny the physical fact, or, admitting the fact, he must assert that it is an ordinary instance of a law of nature. We use the word *assert*, for it will not be contended that a resurrection from the dead is as yet proved to be a law of nature, whatever probability there may be hereafter of its taking its place among the ordinary phenomena of the physical world. And with

regard to this part of the alternative, we say that it is a very bold and unwarrantable assertion, and one that requires a good deal of evidence to make it appear probable to ordinary minds. A fact of history, which does not exemplify any known law, must rest upon the evidence of sense, or upon that of testimony; and in the present case, where sense is excluded, there only remains the evidence of testimony. The whole question is as to the adequacy of the testimony. Let us hear what Professor Baden Powell says on this point:—

‘In appreciating the evidence for any events of a striking or wonderful kind, we must bear in mind the extreme difficulty which always occurs in eliciting the truth, dependent not on the uncertainty in the transmission of testimony, but even in cases where we were ourselves witnesses, on the enormous influence exerted by our prepossessions previous to the event, and by the momentary impressions consequent upon it. We look at all events, through the medium of our prejudices, or even where we may have no prepossessions, the more sudden and remarkable any occurrence may be, the more unprepared we are to judge it accurately or to view it calmly; our after representations, especially of any extraordinary and striking event, are always at best mere recollections of our impressions, of ideas dictated by our emotions at the time, of surprise and astonishment which the suddenness and hurry of the occurrence did not allow us time to reduce to reason, or to correct by the sober standard of experience or philosophy.

‘Questions of this kind are often perplexed for want of due attention to the laws of human thought and belief, and of due distinction in ideas and terms. The proposition “that an event may be so incredible intrinsically as to set aside any degree of testimony,” in no way applies to or affects the honesty or veracity of that testimony, or the reality of the impressions on the minds of the witnesses, so far as it relates to the matter of sensible fact simply. It merely means this: that from the nature of our antecedent convictions, the probability of some kind of mistake or deception somewhere, though we know not where, is greater than the probability of the event really happening in the way and from the causes assigned.

‘This of course turns on the general grounds of our antecedent convictions. The question agitated is not that of mere testimony, of its value, or of its failures. It refers to those antecedent considerations which must govern our entire view of the subject, and which being dependent on higher laws of belief, must be paramount to all attestation, or rather belong to a province distinct from it. What is alleged is a case of the supernatural; but no testimony can reach to the supernatural; testimony can apply only to apparent sensible facts; testimony can only prove an extraordinary and perhaps inexplicable occurrence or phenomenon: that it is due to supernatural causes is entirely dependent on the previous belief and assumptions of the parties.’—Pp. 106, 107.

Well, then, as the denial of the actual fact of the Resurrection is not to be thought of,—for then, to use logical language, *cadit questio*; that we suppose will be admitted to be tantamount to a denial of Christianity, involving either deception or imposture on the part of its first propagators,—we must inquire under what category it is to be placed. Obviously it is to be received as one of those facts which are in the course of time to be included under the generalizations of science.

And here we must guard ourselves against a possible misrepresentation. Observe, then, it is no question here whether the Resurrection itself, in common with all other miracles, may not be referable to some higher law of God's dealings into which it may fit as easily as those other laws of which it appears to be an infraction. Neither party in the dispute at all denies the probability of this. Indeed, if one may speak reverently on a subject which must, except under a new revelation, for ever remain uncertain, it seems to us more consonant to our views of the Divine Nature, that there should be absolute uniformity (whether ever, or how far, to be recognised by His creatures is another point) in the divine operations.

Such uniformity may, for all we know, be implied in the Unity of God. But the question which the Essayist must decide in the affirmative is, whether there is any probability of the Resurrection hereafter taking its place, as an exemplification of some physical law discoverable by man, or whether inductive science is at all pointing in that direction. We need not complicate the matter by going on to press the argument in the case of the Ascension. Whether, for instance, any indications in the theory of gravitation, seem likely to include this fact in the more general law which has to be invented or discovered, for its sake—we are content to take the Resurrection, which, as we have said, is the cardinal point of the evidence for Christianity. It is almost too puerile a supposition to make, and we almost fear we owe our readers an apology for putting the case. The only excuse we can urge for noticing so absurd a theory is, that the theorist was a man of great eminence in scientific pursuits, and that the theory has found admission into a volume which professes to illustrate the 'advantages derivable to the cause of religious and moral truth from a free handling, in a becoming spirit, of subjects peculiarly liable to suffer by the repetition of conventional language and from traditional methods of treatment.'

Professor Powell, then, was bound to show that the Resurrection was likely some day to take its place as a physical fact representative of a physical law, hereafter to be elicited by induction from a comparison of the phenomena of nature. We do not of course pretend to think that he would, for the sake of logical consistency, have avowed a belief in anything so monstrous and preposterous,—and if we have shown that the Essayist cannot escape from the charge of absolute infidelity except by the adoption of a logical contradiction, let us hope that the theory is due to some aberration of intellect, arising from an excessive eagerness to magnify the importance of inductive science, the certainty of its conclusions, and the comprehensiveness of its sphere of application. Let us hope what each may be able to

hope of the individual, but do not let us be imposed upon by vague denunciations of want of charity for exposing a worthless theory to the scorn and contempt which it merits, because its author has passed into a world where human judgment can no longer affect him for good or for evil.

We have said that the *αἰτιον ψεύδος* of the Essay is the treating the physical and the spiritual as if they had no common ground. We proceed to point out some other assumptions made by the same author, with the view of showing that readers must not trust the unproved assertions even of eminent mathematicians. In illustration of his main position, the author asserts that (p. 128), the more knowledge advances, the more it has been, and will be acknowledged that Christianity, as a real religion, must be viewed apart from connexion with physical things. This is an aphorism which we need not have noticed, as it is only a corollary from the previous proposition; but we have copied it down, because there is a slight show of evidence brought to support the position.

The argument stands as follows:—

'The first dissociation of the spiritual from the physical was rendered necessary by the palpable contradictions disclosed by astronomical discovery with the letter of Scripture. Another still wider and more material step has been effected by the discoveries of geology. More recently the antiquity of the human race, and the development of species, and the rejection of the idea of "creation," have caused new advances in the same direction.

'In all these cases there is, indeed, a direct discrepancy between what had been taken for revealed truth and certain undeniable existing monuments to the contrary.

'But these monuments were interpreted by science and reason, and there are other deductions of science and reason referring to alleged events, which, though they have left no monuments or permanent effects behind them, are not the less legitimately subject to the conclusions of positive science, and require a similar concession and recognition of the same principle of the independence of spiritual and physical truth.'—P. 129.

Now here are alleged three so-called discoveries of modern geological science, and others alluded to in evidence of the entire independence of Christianity of physical things; and we have to observe that one of the three discoveries is a mere fancy of the writer's, that there is no such thing as creation; a second is a recently invented theory, which has met with little or no countenance from those scientific men who are most capable of judging of it; and the remaining one, of the antiquity of the human race being greater than was supposed, is a guess supported by a very few facts, and what appears as yet a very gratuitous supposition of exact uniformity in the amount of river deposits for many centuries; what the deductions of science and reason are which point in the same direction we are left to conjecture, so we can say nothing about them. The three that

are adduced, are somewhat shaky props for any hypothesis ; but supposing them to be all true, surely they would not prove that Christianity was independent of physical things, but that the Scriptures of the Old Testament had been wrongly interpreted, according to the erroneous physical theories which have prevailed, but which are now exploded. The inaccuracy of writing appears the more glaring in a writer who had previously published a volume devoted to the subject of representing the entire separation between Judaism and Christianity, and the uselessness of the Old Testament to those who are in possession of the New.

Here, then, are three unproved assertions which nobody believes, which are taken for undoubted truths, and which are brought in evidence for a conclusion with which they have no connexion whatever. Why this author so completely abstains from allusion to the miracles of the New Testament, it is very difficult to guess. If we may hazard a conjecture, we should say that the Professor's attention has been so engrossed in those physical sciences which have been brought under the dominion of mathematical science, and those most immediately connected with them, as entirely to have overlooked the miracles of the New Testament; these being, upon the whole, somewhat of a distinct character from those of the Old Testament, and being more exclusively concerned with human health and life. Certain it is, if the Savilian Professor had been fair, he was bound not to have kept out of sight the Conception and Birth of our Blessed Lord, and His Ascension into heaven ; either of which miracles would have answered our purpose nearly as well as that of the Resurrection, in our attempt to show that Christianity must be embraced with its miracles of fact, or else must be sacrificed together with them. Such cardinal facts as these stand upon a different ground, if we may say so, from many other miracles, even of the New Testament; to take, for instance, any single miracle which we will suppose related only by one evangelist, and to which no very definite allusion is made elsewhere in the sacred writings. We will suppose, for instance, the cure of the man at the pool of Bethesda. It is conceivable that one may be a believer in Christianity, and yet either disbelieve or explain away this particular miracle. Supposing, for instance, that instead of the genuineness of one verse of it, that of the whole account had been doubtful, there would have been nothing remarkable if we found sincere believers in Christianity rejecting it as wanting sufficient authority; or, again, in these days of doubt and questioning, explaining and accounting for things, it would be conceivable that persons admitting the idea of the miraculous should endeavour to represent this case as one which

exhibited the natural appearances of cause and effect. We do not say it would be reasonable; but there are many things which might be said, and which have, in point of fact, been said of this miracle, more or less plausible, with the view of denuding it of its miraculous character. The disease was fanciful; the man seemed worse than he was, or he was a mere impostor, pretending, for some purpose of his own, to be afflicted with a malady under which he was not suffering. We are really almost ashamed to make the suppositions which have been made by German Rationalists to get rid of the miraculous character of a transaction, the external facts of which are undeniable. Those of our readers to whom such things are new, may see many more by referring to Paulus, or to Mr. Powell's volume, entitled 'Christianity not Judaism.' We are not pleading, it will be observed, for the reasonableness of such interpretations, or even for their consistency with the admission of the truths of Christianity; on the contrary, we think them absolutely ridiculous. But what we want to impress upon the readers of 'Essays and Reviews' now is, that such a miracle as this is distinguished from the miracles of the Birth, Resurrection, and Ascension, in that these latter are crucial instances. Christianity has, as we have said, staked itself upon the second; and as to the other two, the impugnors of the miracle cannot adopt any other hypothesis of Christianity than some offshoot of the Socinian heresy.

We proceed with the unproved assertions of Professor Powell. The proposition implied in the following extract is, that *human* beings are entirely distinct from *matter* and from *physical* causes:—

'A great source of misapprehension in this class of arguments has been the undue confusion between the force of *testimony* in regard to human affairs and events in history, and in regard to physical facts. It may be true that some of the most surprising occurrences in ordinary history are currently, and perhaps correctly accepted, on but slight grounds of real testimony; but then they relate to events of a kind which, however singular in their particular concomitant circumstances, are not pretended to be beyond natural causes, or to involve higher questions of intervention.'

'The most seemingly improbable events in human history may be perfectly credible, on sufficient testimony, however contradicting ordinary experience of human motives and conduct—simply because we cannot assign any limits to the varieties of human dispositions, passions, or tendencies, or the extent to which they may be influenced by circumstances of which, perhaps, we have little or no knowledge to guide us. But no such cases would have the remotest applicability to alleged violations of the laws of matter, or interruptions of the course of physical causes.'—P. 132.

In the next extract which we shall make, perhaps some readers will denounce at least one passage as downright atheism. It is not with the view of eliciting any such condemnation that we

produce it, but only as additional evidence of the immense amount of unproved assertion with which this Essay abounds.

'It is for the most part hazardous ground for any general moral reasoner to take, to discuss subjects of evidence which essentially involve that higher appreciation of physical truth which can be attained only from an accurate and comprehensive acquaintance with the connected series of the physical and mathematical sciences. Thus, for example, the simple but grand truth of the law of conservation, and the stability of the heavenly motions, now well understood by all sound cosmical philosophers, is but the type of the universal self-sustaining and self-evolving powers which pervade all nature. Yet the difficulty of conceiving this truth in its simplest exemplification was formerly the chief hindrance to the acceptance of the solar system—from the prepossession of the peripatetic dogma that there must be a constantly acting moving force to keep it going. This very exploded chimera, however, by a singular infatuation, is now actually revived as the ground of argument for miraculous interposition by redoubtable champions who, to evince their profound knowledge of mechanical philosophy, inform us "that the whole of nature is like a mill, which cannot go on without the continual application of a moving power."—P. 134.

Now, supposing the stability of the heavenly motions to be established as an incontrovertible truth, we ask what right has any philosopher to argue from it for the universal self-sustaining and self-ruling powers which pervade our nature? For this is the meaning of the expression used, when stability is spoken of as the *type* of self-evolution. What has stability to do with self-evolution? or what has physical philosophy to do with *types* at all, except in the way of suggesting what it is its business to prove? But, again, we have not done with the argument yet—this author is absolutely greedy of fallacies; he is not content with one fallacy, that the conclusion does not follow from the premises—the premise itself must involve an assumption also. For such of our readers as are not astronomers, we will briefly explain this 'grand truth of the law of conservation and the stability of the heavenly motions.'

In the solar system, each revolving planet disturbs every other planet; and it is conceivable that bodies should have been created of such relative magnitude, and revolving in such orbits, that their disturbances might have in time accumulated, and the whole system have become entirely deranged. Newton's theory of gravitation, with the then existing methods of calculation, did not reach so far as to demonstrate what is called the stability of the system. It was reserved for Laplace to demonstrate, from the fact that the planets all move in the same direction, from the smallness of the eccentricity of their orbits, and their slight inclination to each other, that the secular inequalities are periodical, and that there is a mean state of the planetary system, about which it will oscillate, never very materially deviating from it. The proof of this is one of the

most exquisitely beautiful instances of the power of mathematical analysis.

But the point to be observed here is, that the whole of this calculation is made upon an hypothesis which is far from being certain—viz. the non-existence of any medium in space capable of retarding the motions of the heavenly bodies. Whether there be such a medium or not is still a point undecided. It is, however, the opinion of physical philosophers of the first eminence, that the supposition of such a medium affords the best explanation of the regular apparent acceleration of the motion of Encke's comet. We are not here concerned with the truth of the hypothesis; it is sufficient to allude to the light which is thrown by it upon the evidence for the self-sustaining powers which pervade all nature.

The supposition of a thin atmosphere pervading that portion of space occupied by the solar system, is certainly a gratuitous supposition, but it *may* be true; and if it is true, it involves the extinction of that system; and then the self-evolving power of nature will have to be based upon a different set of facts from the stability of the planetary orbits.

The point for the reader's consideration here, is the amount of credulity as to physical hypothesis, in contrast with the scornful tone adopted as regards religious truth, and the facts of Christianity which rest on human testimony. Running parallel with, and interpenetrating all the fallacies of this *Essay*, is the idea which the author never loses sight of, of the worthlessness of human testimony to events which seem to impugn any supposed law of nature. The author apparently shelters himself under the allegation that all such apparent contradictions will be found to fit into a more general law. Such expectation in the ordinary case of natural things is most just and reasonable; but it is a mere assumption, like every other statement of the *Essay*, that every exception to which human testimony bears witness, must some day fit in to a law cognizable by us. The author considers this matter quite settled by distinguishing the two cases to which testimony is applied, viz. 'historical events,' and 'physical facts.' With the former he denies that it has anything to do, reserving its whole value for cases which it may render credible, on the ground of our ignorance of the variation of human disposition, passion, and tendency, and the incalculable influence of circumstances. Well, what does this amount to, but that testimony is worthless against facts which we know to be true, and of which we know all the bearings and circumstances which can possibly influence them? And what single truth, we ask, is there of which this can be said, excepting the truths of intuition or deduction? And how of these could it

be affirmed that we know all the circumstances which can influence them, unless it were because they are absolutely independent of time and circumstance? It is at this point that the most ridiculous blunder, the most palpable absurdity of Professor Powell's *Essay* occurs. Here is a writer whose acuteness enables him to distinguish between historical events and physical facts, because it suits his theory to do so. He comes forward as the one of the seven whose province it is to advocate the claims of physical science. Mental science he does not profess. He will leave that to Mr. Buckle, of whom, by the way, we may express our astonishment that he has not been associated with the seven. Professor Powell had not knowledge enough of metaphysics or statistics to include the phenomena of mind under the unalterable laws of causation. Neither does he care to do so. We must say we think the 'Essays and Reviews' would have been a much more complete attack upon Christianity, if they had taken the author of 'The History of Civilization' into their number. Really it is expecting too large an amount of credulity in readers to ask them to assent to the self-evolving and self-developing powers of nature—and then believe in the exclusion of the most perfect work of nature from the possession of the same powers of self-improvement; for it must be remembered that Dr. Temple's colossal man of the nineteenth century by no means comes up to this idea of things. Professor Powell's province is, as we have said, physical science, and the seven writers proclaim their independent action. Undoubtedly there are inconsistencies enough to indicate the most ludicrous mismanagement, if there were any common purpose in the seven *Essays*; we do not know whether that purpose was, but we do know that the result obtained has been the throwing doubts upon all that people have hitherto held sacred.

But we have been carried away from our present subject, which is the third *Essay* of the series. The author, as we have seen, makes a broad distinction between historical events and physical facts, and is apparently unconscious that there is any truth independent of these two classes. We do not ask of a sceptical writer on physical science to admit that there are abstract truths in morals, the certainty of which is to some minds greater than that of any historical fact accredited by whatever amount of testimony, or than any law of physical science, however extensively it may appear to account for natural phenomena. We do not care to put before such a writer the elementary truths of the existence of a God, the idea of duty, the supremacy of conscience, and a thousand other truths deducible from or in any way connected with these; but we think it is not expecting much of a mathematician, when we require

him to distinguish between the laws of the material world in operation, and the same as they exist abstractedly from matter. Such a writer might have known that the connexion between the supposed law of gravitation and the elliptic orbit would have held as truth, though there had never been a particle of matter to suggest or to exemplify it, though there had never been a human mind with powers to grasp it. Such an one might have known, from the history of science, that other suppositions have been made, which for aught we know might be true, but which never have been exemplified, but that this does not interfere in the least degree with the truth of the conclusions deducible from such suppositions. And, above all things, it might have been expected of one whose accomplishments extend over the whole range of pure mathematical science, as well as over all those physical sciences which induction has brought under the dominion of mathematical science, that he should have recognised the elementary truths of numbers, as having an eternal and unchangeable existence. We must quote the exact words, or no one will believe that we are not misrepresenting the Professor. In objecting to the doctrine, that 'on a certain amount of testimony we might believe any statement however improbable,' he urges the following (p. 141): 'So that if a number of respectable witnesses were to concur in asseverating that on a certain occasion they had seen two and two make five, we should be bound to believe them! This, perhaps, it will be said is an extreme case.' Now we ask any person however ignorant of philosophy, just to consider for a moment—how it is possible for an abstract proposition to be borne testimony to. We always have supposed that testimony could only apply to alleged facts. The testimony may be true or false, credible or incredible; but the thing testified to, must be testified to as a fact, not as an abstract truth. A man might assert that he perceived or knew what was going on in another part of the world at a given moment, he might say that he had seen an angle trisected, he might persist in his belief that he had seen the sun move from west to east—or any other fact equally unlikely, or, as Professor Powell might express it, equally impossible; but, the testimony alleged applies to a single fact, and not to a law of the material world, nor to an abstract truth independent of matter. Thus a person might be insane enough, or ignorant enough, to impugn the law of gravitation, but he could not bear testimony against the law itself in the abstract. He would only allege that he had seen a fact which overthrew it, which he could not account for, which was inconsistent with it. The law is cognisable not by sense but by intellect. Facts to which testimony applies are objects of sense.

And now let us imagine this extreme case of the very remarkable individual, who should assert that he had seen two and two make five. We do not deny that such words might possibly be used by a lunatic, as anything might be said to which either no meaning, or any vagueness of meaning might be attached by the speaker. But we are supposing people with the same amount of sense and of reason that falls to the lot of mankind in general, and we want to know how this extreme case could be put. It will be admitted, that though people can see two things, they cannot see the number two in the abstract. So that any one who should testify to two and two making five, would have to state that he had seen two individual persons or things, and other two individual persons or things, which, when apart, seemed to him to be two in one place, and two in another. And now these two and two persons or things have to be added together. Now, we want to know, how the process of addition is to be witnessed or described. Two and two can be added together in mind—how is the process to be gone through in fact? We suppose by placing them together. And the testimony borne would probably be somewhat of this nature. Two groups of two separate individuals when united, appeared instead of making four when combined, to produce five individuals. It would really make a very poor conjuring trick. But no conjurer, we suppose, however much he might wish to delude his spectators, would hope to convince them that on every other occasion two and two would appear as five.

A writer who makes such a ridiculous mistake forfeits all character for philosophy, and all right to be heard; neither would it be at all worth while to notice such nonsense were it not for the extraordinary sensation produced by this volume. As it is, we fear many of our readers will consider we have been wasting words upon a matter that is too clear to require argument. All we want to establish is, that writers who make such ludicrous mistakes have no right to be considered philosophers, and that their opinions on matters which they do not prove, are not entitled to carry any weight with them.

We have already seen ample reason for distrusting the unproved assertions of Professor Powell. We have never met with any writings with so great an amount of scepticism in one direction and credulity in another. It is a wonderful instance to show that even first-rate attainments in mathematical science may fail to discipline the mind and enable it to weigh evidence. It has often and with truth been objected against a mathematical education, that it tends towards scepticism, by placing the mind continually in the position of doubting, and, in fact, encouraging it in disbelief in what is not rigidly proved. We think this result might have

been expected *à priori*, and there can be little doubt that in fact many great mathematicians have been great sceptics, if not positive disbelievers in Revelation. But Professor Powell is more eminent for his physical attainments than for mathematical skill. We believe he was considered at one time the greatest authority in this country on the subject of physical optics; and it has always been thought that the sobriety of mind required in inductive science would act as a counterpoise to the defects which deductive processes in pure science were supposed to generate. We have ourselves always entertained the opinion that any science which tended to develop one class of mental faculties would form a dangerous study for young minds. Hence arises the advantage of varying the kinds of subjects to which young minds are accustomed; but no amount of education will ensure the mind against sceptical tendencies so long as there is any connexion between faith and morals. It is, after all, with the heart that man believeth; and though no system can be produced which can bear any comparison, in point of consistency with itself, and reasonable evidence, with revealed Christianity, yet this consideration will weigh very little with such persons as have not a corresponding evidence within to meet external evidences. Under existing circumstances it may seem a little ungracious to insist on this truth, but it is the one truth that is specially kept out of sight by most of the Essayists. The whole matter is treated as a thing of intellectual evidence. This view is most painfully evident throughout Professor Powell's Essay. The Essay is written just as if it would cost the author nothing to give up Christianity, if the case were proved against it; and he seems unable to entertain the view that, in such a case, it would cost one who had been a sincere believer any pain to surrender all the convictions of his life, and the truths which from infancy he had learned to cherish and revere.

We scarcely know whether we have yet put before the reader who has not read this Essay for himself, an adequate description of it; and will add a few words as to the portions of it which have been but lightly touched upon. Let us repeat, then, that the Essayist professes to write in the interest of truth when he denies the possibility of physical miracles. It may seem strange to persons who have been accustomed to view miracles as one of the credentials of Christianity, particularly to such as have too implicitly relied on the authority of Paley, whose argument is in the main correct, though containing occasional incautiousness of expression; it may seem strange that the denial of miracles should be pressed on the ground of advantage to the Christian faith; yet so it is; and the author has skilfully availed himself of the overstatements on the other side of the question, to support

his theory. Thus he attacks what he considers the main assertion of Paley, 'that it is impossible to conceive a revelation given except by means of miracles.' But surely there is plenty of room for standing-ground between the two assertions, that revelation *must* have been given by miracles, and that it could not have been given in this way. One may surely shrink from either assertion, and calmly examine the question, whether, in point of fact, it has been attended by miraculous agency. It is certain that if it has not, it loses all claim to belief, for, as we have observed again and again, it stakes its credit upon a miracle.

Premising, then, what we surely are at liberty to premise, that we have already shown the absurdity of the attempt to reconcile a reception of Christianity with the denial of miraculous agency; premising also that the Essay has shown no shadow of reason for the denial of miracles, which denial rests solely on the unproved assertion of the author, that it is inconceivable that the laws of nature should be interfered with; we will say a few words as to Professor Powell's professed object,—viz. the vindication of the Christian faith at the expense of the credibility of miracles.

The author truly observes, that the view of evidence in general, and of miraculous evidence in particular, is mainly a Protestant view, and has grown up since the Reformation; being a product, as it were, of the inquiring, doubtful tone of mind, generated partly by the corrupt state of the Church, partly by the general diffusion of thought through the printing-press. Neither can it well be denied that the prevailing view of miracles advocated in part of the seventeenth and throughout the eighteenth century, was something like an appeal to the intellect to be convinced of the truth of Christianity by certain facts, which made no more appeal to man's moral nature than so many conjuring tricks might be supposed to do. Again, it must be acknowledged that, upon comparison of the tone of earlier works with those of later date, and of these again, with writings of our own day, we find a great change in the tastes and opinions of the times. Earlier writers have been superseded by later; and especially there arose a necessity for the Protestant principle, if it was to retain its ascendancy, to invent some method of discrediting ecclesiastical miracles which should not have the effect of disparaging those of Scripture. We need not follow the author through his attack upon the clumsy view of Warburton, which suggested the necessity of the miracles as a criterion of its truth. To any believer in the Old Testament, it is evident the miracles of Elisha must be sacrificed on this principle; but Professor Powell, who treats the Old Testament as a thing of the past, entirely to be forgotten, does not, of course, urge this argument. Neither need more be said here of Douglas'

criterion, viz. the connexion of inspiration with miraculous power, except that it is eminently unsatisfactory. Neither are we concerned to discuss the comparative evidence for ecclesiastical miracles as distinct from Scriptural. Whether there are any difficulties specially belonging to the former, and of what nature they are,—which may be considered fairly substantiated, and which, on the contrary, must be pronounced destitute of sufficient proof, are very interesting questions; but they are beside the present point, as even on the supposition of their entire falsehood, the truth of Christianity, as a whole, may fairly dispense with them, and rest upon the evidences of miraculous power possessed and displayed by our Lord and His apostles. What the author alleges may be admitted, that (p. 102) 'the appeal was mainly to the miracles of the Gospels,' but when he adds that 'here it was contended we want merely 'the same testimony of eye-witnesses which would suffice to 'substantiate any ordinary matter of fact,' we have another of those numerous instances of unproved assertion and misrepresentation with which the Essay, and, we may add, the whole volume, abounds. We never have seen it alleged anywhere, neither do we believe it ever has been urged, that an alleged miracle is *primâ facie* as credible as an ordinary event; an ordinary event is believed as a matter of course on the statement of an ordinary individual; it is only when the event is unusual and unlikely that people suspend their judgment till additional testimony confirms the truth of what they have heard. So that it is a mere misrepresentation of the case to accuse writers on the evidences of Christianity of affirming that *merely* the same testimony is required for a miracle which would satisfy people as to any common matter of fact.

Moreover, the Professor tacitly implies, both here and elsewhere, that each alleged miracle should separately be (we do not say examined, which would be sufficiently unfair, but) dismissed from consideration on the *à priori* ground of the impossibility of miraculous interference; whereas, in point of fact, the case has a right to be considered as a whole.

It is not like the case of persons testifying to a fact which has come under their observation, and of which they do not profess to know more than what is palpable to sense, a fact which they leave for the scientific to investigate and make what they can of. Many people were convinced, for instance, that tables turned round without sufficient mechanical power being applied to account for such turning. Yet such people did not, at least in many cases, believe there was anything supernatural or inexplicable in the matter. But the miracles of the New Testament, it must be remembered, are many, and are alleged both by the

workers themselves and by Christians now, as, supernatural events, and as parts of a large system, embracing a great many other somewhat similar events, some of them quite like ordinary matters of history, and some for instance, as S. Paul's shaking off the viper, which it would be difficult to class with either kind of events; and cures which, without being distinctly miraculous, produced similar effects with those ascribed to miraculous agency. Now it will be said that, in all this, we are not touching Professor Powell's argument, which is professedly directed not against Christianity, which he adopts, but against the miraculous evidence for Christianity, which he rejects; but we have, we think, at least the right to demand of one who rejects what the Christian world universally holds, to substitute some explanation of the miracles recorded in the Acts of the Apostles in place of the commonly received acceptance of them, as attestations of the power conferred by Christ upon His apostles. The author, in a previously published volume, which was, two years ago, noticed in this *Review*, gave us an analysis of what others thought of some of the New Testament miracles; but we are not aware that he has ever elaborated a theory of his own, which shall dispose of the awkward facts of the cure at the Beautiful gate of the Temple, the deaths of Ananias and Sapphira, the blindness inflicted on Elymas, the cure of the impotent man at Lystra, the casting out of the spirit of divination at Philippi, and others. We omit the notice of the recoveries wrought at Ephesus by means of the handkerchiefs and aprons brought from S. Paul to the sick, as well as the raising from the dead, as being results which the author might attribute to fancy, and so class under the head of the spiritual world. We think it must be admitted that, whatever may be said of any one of the above-quoted miracles, yet, taken together, they form a body of facts singularly awkward to account for on any other supposition than the existence of a power which could and which did interfere with the ordinary laws of nature. However, the view with which these are here alleged is to exhibit the amount of unproved statement in this Essay; we need not insist upon the fact that these instances are tolerably strong evidence in *disproof* of the fundamental view advocated by Professor Powell.

Still, Professor Powell's view is, as we have said, to defend Christianity at the expense of miracles. That the theory is demonstrably untenable, under every view of it that can be taken, is true enough indeed; but that is not our immediate object to maintain. His position seems to be that of a man who has associated much with scientific men of various shades of belief and unbelief, and who has been especially struck by the notion which is expressed by Theodore Parker in the illogical

language, that a miracle is impossible, because everywhere there is found law, as the constant mode of operation of an infinite God—(we should like much to know how nature and nature's laws prove the infinity of God)—otherwise and somewhat more logically expressed, by Wegscheider, that 'the belief in a super-natural, miraculous, immediate revelation of Himself seems not very reconcilable with the idea of an everlasting God, of unchangeable purpose.' The position which the Protestant principle seems in our day forced to adopt, is that of surrendering in succession such doctrines of the faith as are objected to by persons who wish to retain some vestiges of Christianity, or who are unable wholly to divest themselves, as Mr. F. Newman has succeeded in doing, of the prejudices of early education. Thus, one comes forward as the advocate of universal restitution; another surrenders the doctrine of vicarious sacrifice and propitiation; and the last phase of development is represented in Professor Powell's attempt to make Christianity palatable to those who reject its principal credentials. The Essayist argues that it is not the facts about which people are at issue in any alleged case of miraculous interference, but the assigning the right interpretation to those facts, the ascribing them to their true causes. Now, this in many cases, even of miracles recorded in Scripture, is quite true. The same may be observed of many alleged extraordinary occurrences of ancient and modern times. Take, for instance, the miraculous recovery of sight worked by Vespasian. There may be a question raised as to how the thing was done, but the facts of the case are incontestable. Again, the cures of the malady called 'the king's evil,' by the royal touch, cannot be denied. The true account of them may, perhaps, be different from the following, as given by Bishop Bull (Works, vol. i. p. 133; Oxford Edit. 8vo. 1827):—

'Hereby it appeared, that the gift of curing diseases without the help of art or nature was indeed a gift, and a gift of God, and so given by Him to His Apostles, that they could not exercise it arbitrarily, and at their own pleasure, but only to whom, when, where, and how God pleased, and should direct them to make use of that power; that so the glory of all the wonderful cures wrought by them might at last redound to God the author, and not to man the instrument.

'And (by the way) perhaps this is the best account that can be given of the relic and remainder of the primitive miraculous gift of healing, for some hundreds of years past, visible in this our nation, and annexed to the succession of our Christian kings: I mean the cure of that otherwise incurable disease called *morbus regius*, or the king's evil. That divers persons desperately labouring under it have been cured by the mere

'touch of the royal hand, assisted with the prayers of the priests of our Church attending, is unquestionable, unless the faith of all our ancient writers, and the consentient report of hundreds of most credible persons in our own age, attesting the same, be to be questioned. And yet, they say some of those diseased persons return from that sovereign remedy *re infectâ*, without any cure done upon them. How comes this to pass? God hath not given this gift of healing so absolutely to our royal line, but that He still keeps the reins of it in His own hand, to let them loose, or restrain them, as He pleaseth.'

These are instances in which people who admit the facts may still be at issue about the explanation of those facts.

But here, as usual, the author has been guilty of an enormous assumption. It is taken for granted that the question at issue is one of cause and not of fact in all cases, because it is so in certain cases. Let the number of miraculous cures of the cause of which there is a doubt, be as great as any one may claim them to be, there remain an immense number about which the whole issue rests on the *fact*. We need scarcely say that the cardinal miracle of the Resurrection is one of this kind. And the main argument of this Essay rests wholly upon this supposition, for in fact the attempts to discredit human testimony are nothing more than an exhibition of a desire on the part of the writer to pare off all such parts of a narrative as are inconsistent with the doctrine that a miracle is impossible, and to leave the remainder to fit in as best it may with the laws of nature, as already known or hereafter to be discovered.

Thus the author says (p. 107):—

'The question agitated is not that of mere testimony, of its value or of its failures. It refers to those *antecedent* considerations which must govern our entire view of the subject, and which, being dependent on higher laws of belief, must be paramount to all attestation, or rather belong to a province distinct from it. What is alleged is a case of the supernatural; but no testimony can reach to the supernatural; testimony can apply only to apparent sensible facts; testimony can only prove an extraordinary and perhaps inexplicable occurrence or phenomenon; that it is due to supernatural causes, is entirely dependent on the previous belief and assumptions of the parties.' Now we beg to call attention to this paragraph. It is one of those at first sight apparently reasonable passages with which this Essay abounds, but which, when examined closely, are based upon a mere fallacy. What contradiction is there, we ask, between the supernatural and sensible facts? The Resurrection was certainly both supernatural and a sensible fact. What the

author meant, we beg his pardon, we should say, what the author ought to have meant, was that testimony applies to facts and not to abstractions or laws; and then no one would have found fault with him for adding, that the natural or supernatural character of the transaction will have to be judged of by reason. We will add for ourselves, that persons who are persuaded of the Almighty's power to do what He wills with the creatures He has made, will be open to any evidence which will establish the miraculous nature of any given operation, whilst those who consider with Professor Powell, that nature works for herself, or that there are conclusive reasons for believing that her laws, as cognizable by us, cannot be interfered with by their Creator, will shut their eyes to any thing that seems to contravene this belief. But why the former class should be sneered at and stigmatized as bigots rather than the latter, we profess we are not logicians enough to understand.

Though it is intimated that the number of people who disbelieve miracles is great, and that the prevalent conviction is that miracles are not to be expected, and that alleged marvels are commonly discredited, yet the author admits, that there are still to be found persons who firmly believe in the occurrence of certain miracles in our own times. These are dismissed, with the summary explanation,—‘that we invariably find that this is only in connexion with their own particular tenets.’ Here is another assertion very wide of the truth. To notice other instances of this, there are many who have been convinced of miraculous powers possessed by St. Francis Xavier, who are far from adopting Roman views of religion. If the author means by ‘particular tenets’ the faith of Christianity, he would have been nearer the truth, but the expression would not have suited him so well; whilst the arguments of all who advocate miracles as credentials of Christianity, are set aside as the reasonings ‘of those who have failed to grasp the positive scientific idea of the power of the inductive philosophy or the *order of nature*.’

This positive scientific idea must, we think, be very hard to grasp, since, as far as we know, no Christian philosopher besides Professor Powell has yet attained to it. Neither does he explain to us how he has reached it, whether by revelation, or intuition, or deduction. If it is an inductive truth, and in no other way can the laws of matter be elicited, according to any ordinary laws of human nature, we humbly submit that it must be content to be tested by every occurrence that shall at any time hereafter be brought to bear against it. The very test of its truth will be its ability to bear being confronted with fact; and if any one shall say that the law of gravitation, the best established law of physics in the universe, shall never meet with any

fact which shall suggest a modification of it, or which shall distinctly interfere with it in the way of miraculous interposition, we say that such person is affirming more than he can prove. What will be discovered in the future we do not know; we have every reason to suppose from the analogy of the past, that the coming age will enlarge the generalizations of science as it exists at present. The boundaries of nature, says our Essayist, exists only where our *present* knowledge places them; the discoveries of to-morrow will alter and enlarge them. But who would have thought that any one pretending to the name of a philosopher would have committed himself to such a statement as the following:—‘The inevitable progress of research ‘must, within a longer or shorter period, unravel all that seems ‘most marvellous; and what is at present least understood will ‘become as familiarly known to the science of the future as those ‘points which a few centuries ago were involved in equal ‘obscurity, but are now thoroughly understood’?

We have no time for more; but we shall not make the want of time an excuse for not presenting our readers with a definitely elaborated theory of miracles. On the contrary, we believe that no such thing is possible. God has seen fit to exhibit his power in a mode in which, in by far the largest number of instances He has permitted man to trace somewhat of His purpose, and to investigate some way into the laws of cause and effect. In certain cases He has acted in such way as to controvert all the laws which we know, or can know, except by revelation; but He has not given the power to man of drawing a definite line which shall enable any one to decide upon those numerous cases which occupy the border land between the ordinary and the miraculous. It would indeed be unlike all other parts of the scheme of Revelation if the appeal of faith were made merely to the intellect, and the evidence on which conviction was to be framed, were independent of the moral character of him to whom the appeal was made.

ART. VIII.—*An Introduction to the Study of Dogmatic Theology.*
By the Rev. ROBERT OWEN, B.D., Fellow of Jesus College,
Oxford. London: Masters.

THE originators of the *Edinburgh Review* first, we believe, introduced the practice of making a book serve as a mere peg, whereon to hang an article. The plan, though frequently found a source of convenience to the reviewer, is not always equally gratifying to the author of the book, which is thus employed. Mr. Owen's volume is one of those which deserves a more extended notice than the very brief one accorded in our last number, where it was, we must own, treated in the above-mentioned rather uncomplimentary fashion. We now propose to give some account of its contents, speaking freely as we proceed respecting its merits and defects, and reserving to ourselves the right to make a few general remarks (if we can find room for them) before we conclude.

By a sort of conventional understanding it is commonly assumed, that the examiner is necessarily superior in learning to the examinee, and the reviewer to the reviewed. At the very outset we willingly, in the present instance, disclaim any such assumption. Our learning, in the particular department of knowledge which is discussed in Mr. Owen's work, is most probably far inferior to his. Such a confession need not, however, imply either that our account of his volume must be incorrect; or that we may not legitimately prefer the explanations of certain terms and propositions contained in other books; or, thirdly, that we may not with justice and propriety call attention to certain considerations which he appears to have overlooked.

The book before us is a rather closely printed octavo, of nearly 500 pages, and is divided into thirty-one chapters. A valuable preface ably points out the difficulties of composing such a treatise, and names the leading volumes, Patristic, Scholastic, or subsequent to the Reformation, whence assistance may be derived. Among these, the writings of Anglican divines are the least often appealed to, on the very reasonable ground of the facility with which they may be consulted.

* On the first three chapters, which are mainly occupied with Faith, Holy Scripture, and the authority of the Church, we shall say little more than that they are well written and may be

read with profit. Exhaustive of course they do not pretend to be, for in that case the work would be a great deal more than an *Introduction* to this province of Theology. Among topics deserving of notice in these chapters may be mentioned—a remarkable admission of Cardinal Cajetan, respecting the inferior rank of the Apocrypha, which almost coincides with our own sixth article (p. 20); a brief extract from Origen *περὶ ἀρχῶν* which might have saved Professor Jowett from some recent (not very wise) assertions, in reference to that Father (p. 24); a beautiful passage from S. John Damascene, on the study of the Holy Scripture (pp. 26, 7); the limitation of the use of tradition laid down by S. Vincent of Lerins (pp. 34, 5); the remarks of the foreign Protestant Chamier on S. Mary as *semper Virgo* (pp. 44, 5); an able statement of Cardinal Panormitan, on the *representative* character of Councils; and some observations of the author himself, on the primary meaning of S. Matthew xviii. 17 (p. 31), on the well-known and strange statement of S. Irenæus about Millennial Bliss (p. 41), and on other topics which exhibit a really happy combination of independence of thought with true reverence. To relieve the dulness of such an enunciation as the above, we cite, at second-hand, from Mr. Owen, a portion of the passage of Damascene, to which reference has just been made.

“He that asketh receiveth, and he that seeketh findeth; and to him that knocketh it shall be opened.” Let us knock then at the most beautiful paradise of the Scriptures, the fragrant, the sweetest, the most comely, that resounds about our ears with all kinds of songs of intellectual God-inspired birds; that lays hold of our heart, soothing it when in pain, calming it when stirred by passion, and filling it with everlasting joy; that setteth our understanding on the golden and brilliant back of the Divine Dove, and on its brightest wings leadeth us up to the Only-Begotten Son and heir of the planter of the everlasting vineyard, and through Him bringeth us near to the Father of Lights. But let us not knock idly, but rather earnestly and continuously. Let us not faint in knocking, for so shall it be opened to us. If we read once and again, and do not quite perceive what we read, let us not faint but tarry; let us converse, let us ask; for, “ask thy father,” it says, “and he shall declare it unto thee, thy elders, and they shall tell thee,” for knowledge belongeth not to all. Let us draw out of the well of this paradise, overflowing and purest waters springing up to life eternal. Let us luxuriate in them insatiably, let us take our fill, for they possess grace free of cost. And if we can derive any profit also from what is beside them, it is not forbidden. Let us become approved money-changers, laying up the genuine and pure gold, but rejecting the counterfeit.’

The chapter on the Existence and Attributes of God, is (for the size of the work) long and interesting. Yet it strikes us as being less complete than many other portions of the volume. Mr. Owen might, we think, have consulted with advantage Dr. Clarke’s ‘Boyle Lectures,’ on the same subject; a volume of such merit, that even Dr. Newman, if we are not mistaken, recom-

mended it to the Roman Catholic pupils under his authority during his sojourn in Dublin. Clarke sums up the Divine Attributes as ultimately referrible to these three leading ones, Omnipotence, Omniscience, and Perfect Goodness. Nor is it easy to conceive any attribute of the Almighty, which may not in some sense be considered as falling under one of these three. But Mr. Owen, while treating of those Attributes which may be classed under Perfect Power, and Perfect Knowledge, has, most unaccountably, neglected to speak, in this place, of God's Justice, Truth, and other Moral Perfections. Yet surely Clarke is justified in asserting that these last-named Perfections must, *of necessity*, belong to the Supreme Cause and Author of all things quite as much as the Perfection of Might or of Wisdom. *Bonitas* occupies a conspicuous place in the first part of the *Summa* of Aquinas (Qu. VI.), who lays it down *quodd bonum esse Deo præcipue convenit*; and is handled in like manner by Bishop Pearson in his Lectures *de Deo et Attributis*. Among the principles enforced by Pearson are these following; *Deum esse bonum bonitate absolutâ*; *Deum esse ὑπεράγαθον*; *Deum aded bonum esse, ut causa sit omnis bonitatis creatæ*.¹

We do not, of course, mean to imply that Mr. Owen would for a moment hesitate in admitting the truth of these and other cognate propositions, which at once commend themselves to the acceptance of every devout Christian. But their absence is to be remarked upon, because they are most intimately connected with the attribute of Omnipotence, which, at the first glance, they almost seem to limit. For if the absolute Goodness of God prevents him from altering, or dispensing with, the Moral Law,—and Aquinas, Hooker, Butler, Clarke, Cudworth, Suarez, all proclaim His inability to alter or dispense with it—how can He be, in strictness, said to be Almighty? These divines, with many more, reply, that such limitation does by no means interfere with the Omnipotence of God, inasmuch as His Goodness, like each of His other attributes, is identical with Himself, and the law which He ever obeys is a law that is self-imposed. His own Perfections alone limit Him. 'God cannot lie;' because He is the absolute and perfect Truth. These considerations tend, moreover, to show the close and indissoluble connexion that exists between *Dogmatic* and *Moral* Theology; and hence arises another source of interest.

However, we must not permit our sense of an omission to obscure our perception of what this chapter really contains. It is only justice to say, that it imparts much solid information, which will not, so far as our experience reaches, be readily

¹ Minor Works. Ed. Churton, vol. i. pp. 67—72.

discovered in any other English book. We may instance the explanation of the difference between the Incommunicable and Communicable Attributes of the Creator. Under the former class are ranked His Simplicity, Unity, Immutability, Eternity, and Omnipresence. These, it is evident, cannot be bestowed upon the creature. The immortality of the soul is not only unlike that of its Maker in being imparted; but likewise in that it looks forward only, not backward. To the Almighty, and to Him alone, belongs, in scholastic phrase, *Æternitas à parte post et ante*; to us only the *Æternitas à parte post*. Hence, perhaps (as we once heard a distinguished living divine remark) the extreme difficulty felt by the mind in even *conceiving* the idea of eternity in the past, an eternity that has had no beginning. We can much more easily bring home to ourselves the idea of eternity in the future. Indeed, the difficulty here lies on the side of all attempts to shake it off; as unbelievers have often sadly experienced. For to that eternity we were destined from our birth; whether an eternity of weal or woe lies in our own power. *εἰη δ' ἐνὶ νύκτιν, δι' Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.*

But there are other attributes which (in a measure) God can impart, and does impart, to his creatures. Such for example are life and wisdom. That it is possible for a created nature to partake very largely of these gifts, is shown by the way in which they have been communicated to the humanity of the Incarnate Son. 'For as the Father hath life in Himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in Himself; and hath given Him authority to execute judgment also, *because He is the Son of Man*. . . . In whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge.'¹

Among the many merits of Mr. Owen's volume must be reckoned the explanation of terms, which though of frequent occurrence, are by no means commonly understood. In the chapter now under consideration, he takes the opportunity of explaining the useful distinction of Peter Lombard respecting the *Voluntas beneplaciti* and the *Voluntas signi*; the former being the secret, the latter the revealed Will of God. Our author, however, refrains from committing himself to all that the Master of the Sentences alleges on this point: but cites happily, by way of illustrating the actual existence of such a distinction, the words of Moses in the book of Deuteronomy (xxix. 29), 'The secret things belong unto the Lord our God; but the things which are revealed belong unto us and to our children for ever.'²

¹ S. John v. 26, 27; Col. ii. 3.

² Mr. Owen says (p. 104) with reference to Peter Lombard, that 'to introduce anything like contradiction or change into God's Will, would be to run counter

Of the chapter on the Holy Trinity we have only to speak in terms of commendation. The *περιχώρησις* (in Latin *Circumincessio*), is well explained as 'the existence and presence of the 'Persons in one another by reason of their identity of nature 'and essence;' and is finely illustrated by the following words of S. John Damascene:—

'We cannot speak of local distance in the case of the uncircumscribed Godhead, as we can in our own; for the persons are in each other, not so as to be confused, but so as to inhere, according to the word of the Lord, who said, "Believe me that I am in the Father and the Father in Me." Now, can we speak of difference of will, or of judgment, or of operation, or of power, or of aught else, which things beget in us the practical and complete distinction. Wherefore also we do not say that the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost are three Gods, but rather One God, the Holy Trinity; the Son and Spirit being referred to One Cause, not composed nor commingled, according to the comprehension of Sabellius (*συναίπεσις*); for they are united, as we said, not so as to be confused, but so as to inhere in one another. And they have their *circumincession* in one another without any commixture or confusion; neither emanating or essentially sundered, according to Arius's division (*διαίρεσις*); for the Godhead is inseparable in separate (persons), and as in three suns close to one another and that are inseparable, the blending and cohesion of light is one.'—Pp. 123-4. [*S. Jo. Damasc., De Orthod. Fide, cap. 8.*]

We observe that Mr. Owen just touches upon the deep, and probably insoluble, question, why the Holy Spirit is not a Son; or, in other words, how Divine procession may be held to differ from Divine generation. Without denying the lawfulness of reverent speculation upon such a subject, we see no reason to alter an opinion expressed in this Review some six years since; namely, that the confession which S. Augustin makes of his ignorance in this matter, is more satisfactory than the attempted explanation of Aquinas.¹

From the sixth chapter of this volume, treating of the Second Person of the Most Holy Trinity, we have much pleasure in quoting the following words, which proceed from the author's own pen. [We are responsible for the italics.]

'It was the usual practice of the early Christian writers, in introducing the doctrines of the faith to the consideration of the heathen philosophers, to blend the Revelation of the Second person of the Trinity with the received theories concerning the archetypal Reason or Intellect, which framed the visible universe, and emanated directly from the mysterious and hidden First Cause of all things. It may be that they erred on the side of indiscreet zeal: that in their anxiety to smooth the way for the acceptance of Christianity by many

'to His attribute of Immutability.' We much doubt whether the venerable Schoolman would have allowed that his assertions *did* involve any change of the Divine Will. He merely says that God has at times ordered what he did not really will, '*præcepit enim Abrahæ immolare filium, nec tamen voluit, nec ideo præcepit ut id fieret, sed ut Abrahæ probaretur fides.*' (Lib. i. Dist. xlv.)

¹ Some remarks of Aquinas are cited by Mr. Owen, p. 121. For S. Augustin, see cont. Maximinum ii. 14, or *Christian Remembrancer* for July, 1855, p. 123.

who came as near to the Truth as unaided human reason would allow, they mixed up too much of the earthly element with the heavenly, and laid the foundation for future heresies. *But it is not for us who have entered on the inheritance of the faith without preconceived ideas to be removed, or difficulties to be harmonized, whose belief too often amounts to nothing better than an indolent uninterested assent to propositions recommended by custom or authority; it is not for us to blame them lightly, or to affect the supercilious brow of an immaculate and superior criticism.* Be it ours to accept the results of their stammering efforts and acquiesce in the decisions of the Catholic Church. It was necessary to assume some starting point in opening the ground which issued in the rich harvest of the Gentiles, and the fresh turn which the fathers gave to the Platonic disquisitions respecting the Logos or Divine Reason, was as legitimate as S. Paul's developing the incident of the Athenian inscription "to the Unknown God," into a declaration of Him whom they ignorantly worshipped. The Jewish belief in the coming Messiah, however alloyed with dreams of His temporal splendour, and invariably falling far short of the pure spiritual type of the reality, still formed the basis whence Apostolic missionaries might win souls to the obedience of the faith. And the purest Greek philosophy was, as it were, a thinner and clearer atmosphere through which the light of the Gospel might shine forth serenely.'

Our limits compel us to pass by two interesting chapters upon the Holy Angels, and the Fallen ones. These chapters supply valuable information respecting the famous book, once attributed to S. Dionysius the Areopagite, the convert of S. Paul. The following remarks, which Mr. Owen translates from Origen, are very sound and practical :

'For as in some things, the human purpose alone by itself is imperfect towards the consummation of good, for by the Divine aid is everything brought to perfection : so also in contrary things we receive certain beginnings, and as it were some seeds of sins from those things which we have naturally in use. But when we have indulged more than enough, and have not made a stand against the first motions of intemperance, then the hostile influence taking the place of this first transgression, instigates and over-urges us, by all means studying to enlarge sins more profusely ; we men, indeed, supplying the occasions and beginnings of sins, but the adverse powers propagating them more widely and further, it may be, without any end. We are not, however, to suppose that aught else befalls us from the good or evil thoughts themselves which are suggested to our hearts, except a commotion only and incitement provoking us to good or to evil. For, when the malignant influence begins to incite us to evil, it is possible for us to cast away from us bad suggestions, and resist the worst persuasions, and altogether do nothing blameable. Therefore is it written, "Keep thy heart with all diligence ; for out of it are the issues of life," and "Be ye angry and sin not : neither give place to the devil," "Lest Satan should get an advantage of us, for we are not ignorant of his devices.'

In the chapter which follows (that, namely on the 'Creation and Government of the World,') Mr. Owen has hardly, we think, done justice to the Patristic evidence in favour of supposing the Mosaic days to be lengthened periods. We mentioned in our last number, the remarkable circumstance, that such an interpretation had occurred to the minds of Saints and Doctors, such as Athanasius, Augustin, Anselm, Origen, and others ;

and gave a few extracts¹ and references, none of which appear in the volume before us. Now this is not an unimportant matter; for it is a common device of rationalistic writers of our time, sometimes despite their knowledge, but more often in sheer ignorance, to maintain that such interpretations of the first chapter of Genesis simply date from the time of geological discoveries, and were invented as a mere subterfuge from the pressure of an acknowledged difficulty. A statement of this nature is evidently implied, in a recent account of the teaching of 'Essays and Reviews,' by a French layman of somewhat rationalistic bias, M. Edmond Scherer.²

On the origin of Evil, our author, in the main, adopts what is perhaps the safest line, and the one which probably counts in its favour a majority of orthodox theologians; viz. to confess that it is an inscrutable mystery, and there leave it. We say *in the main*, because he does mention a few theories concerning it on the just and reasonable ground that, 'although it is hopeless to attempt an investigation of so primary a mystery, it is not useless to cast about for reasons to calm the human intellect, and to persuade it to acquiesce in the ignorance which its Maker has thought right to impose.' (P. 213). We have here, incidentally through S. John Damascene, the important distinction between what God permits, and what He actually operates. It may be remarked in passing, that the non-recognition of this distinction in Mohammedan theology is the fruitful source of great confusion of thought, and of miserable, however unintentional, distortion of the representation of the Divine character and attributes.

The treatment of the 'Creation of Man,' gives occasion for a clear and forcible statement of the arguments against the pre-existence of souls. The curious, further question, whether souls are formed by separate *de-cisions* from the parent soul breathed into Adam, or are newly created for each body, is temperately discussed. These opposing views are, as is well known, termed respectively by the schoolmen, Traducianism and Creatianism. Our own opinion is, that Creatianism appears to have in its favour, the greater weight of argument and authority. But we are not convinced that Aquinas proves his right to stigmatize Traducianism as *heretical*, even when it is applied to the production of the intellectual *anima*; nor should we have cited his

¹ *Art.* Dogma in relation to 'Essays and Reviews,' pp. 465—6.

² *Revue des deux Mondes*, for 15th May, 1861. The *Edinburgh Review* for last April, represents the criticism of 'Essays and Reviews' in the *Westminster Review* for October, 1860, as hopelessly false and unfair. It is curious to see how similar is the impression made by the volume on the cool, unbiassed understanding of M. Scherer to that of the writer in the *Westminster*.

language on this subject, as is done by Mr. Owen, without some degree of reservation.

The twelfth chapter introduces a question, of which the proper investigation would demand a far greater space than we can at present afford. It is this; what is the amount of patristic evidence in favour of the lawfulness of a purely figurative interpretation of the early chapters of Genesis? We say a *purely* figurative interpretation; for it is a great mistake to suppose that when the Fathers talk of a figurative sense, they *necessarily* mean to deny the substratum of fact.

We quit Mr. Owen's book for a moment, to illustrate this point. In a recent pamphlet by a clergyman of note, who was Hulsean Lecturer at Cambridge in 1853, we find the following assertions:

'S. Augustin thought that it was preposterous to assert that the beginning of Genesis might not be interpreted figuratively. . . . S. Augustin held that all the account of creation might be figurative, and that "*nullus Christianus dicere audebit, non esse accipienda figuratiter.*"'—*Address on Orthodoxy and Rationalism*, by Rev. B. M. Cowie, pp. 12, 21.¹

Now not only does Mr. Cowie give us a reference to his author, *De Genesi ad Literam*, I. 1, but he translates, with perfect correctness, ten or eleven lines. The conclusion of his translated extract runs as follows. 'For no Christian will dare to say that they are not to be taken figuratively, when he gives heed to the Apostle saying, "All these things happened unto them in a figure," (1 Cor. x. 2), and reminding us that the record in Genesis, "And they two shall be one flesh," is a great Sacrament, referring to God and the Church.'

Now to us it seems that Augustin here raises a question which he does not completely answer. He begins with a reference to the possibility of a purely figurative meaning (*figuratum tantummodo intellectum*). He proceeds to prove that certain texts are to be accepted figuratively, but the word *only* does not re-appear. Is it to be conceived that the Bishop of Hippo understood S. Paul to signify, that because the events of Jewish history bear a typical meaning they did not actually happen, or that the matrimony of our first parents was the less a reality because it typified the infinitely sublimer union of Christ with His Church?

We cannot think that any careful student of S. Augustin will acquiesce in such a conclusion. In his work against Faustus, the Manichæan (lib. xxii. cap. 24), S. Augustin writes: 'I say that not merely the tongue, but even the life of these men was prophetic, and that the entire rule of the Hebrews was

¹ London. Bell and Daldy, 1861.

'one mighty prophet, because [the prophet] of a certain Mighty One. "For all those things," as the Apostle says, "were our types (*figuræ nostræ*)."'

And if this be not sufficient to show the sentiments of the writer, let us turn to the *De Civitate Dei* (Lib. xiii. Cap. 21). Hence some refer the whole of that Paradise, where the first parents of the human race are recorded to have been in the truth of Holy Scripture, to objects of thought (*intelligibilia*), and turn those trees and fruit-bearing shrubs into the virtues and morals of life; as if they were not visible and material, but said or written in that style with a view to the signification of objects of thought. As if Paradise could not be a material one (*corporalis*) because it may likewise be regarded in a spiritual point of view (*quia potest etiam spiritualis intelligi*); as if there were not two women, Agar and Sarah, and from them two sons of Abraham, one from the bond-maid, one from the free woman, because the Apostle says that two Testaments were prefigured in them, or as if water had not flowed from a rock at the stroke of Moses, because in a figurative signification Christ may therein also be perceived, since the same Apostle says, "for that rock was Christ." Augustin proceeds to mention various possible interpretations (as *e.g.* that the four rivers have been taken to represent the four cardinal virtues; or again the four Holy Gospels) and then adds, 'If these and any other things may be more suitably said on the spiritual sense of Paradise, let them be said without hindrance from any man; provided, however, that the truth of that history be believed, as commended to us by a most faithful narrative of events.' It may, however, be thought by some, that S. Augustin had changed his mind, and that it is unfair to answer a question proposed in one of his treatises by an extract taken from another. This doubt is easily set at rest. In the first chapter of the eighth book of this very same treatise, *De Genesi ad Literam*, we read as follows: 'I am not ignorant that many have said much on the subject of Paradise. There are, however, so to speak, three usual opinions on this matter. One, of those who would have Paradise understood only in a material sense. Another, of those who take it only in a spiritual sense. A third, of those who understand Paradise in each sense, at one time materially, but at another spiritually (*aliàs corporaliter, aliàs autem spiritaliter*). To speak briefly, I confess that I like this third opinion. . . . The narrative, then, in these books is not to be classed with discourses concerning things figurative, as in the Song of Songs, but of thorough facts (*omnino gestarum*) as in the Books of Kings, and the like.'

Mr. Cowie should surely have looked more closely into this

matter before he twice declared to the Fellows of Sion College, that S. Augustin 'held that all the account of creation might be figurative.'

We return to Mr. Owen. He quotes on this head the well-known words of Aquinas. 'Those things which are said in Scripture of Paradise are set forth by manner of historical narrative. But in all things which Scripture so delivers, the truth of history is to be held for a foundation, and spiritual expositions are to be framed thereupon (*est pro fundamento tenenda veritas historice: et desuper spirituales expositiones fabricandæ*).'¹ The following from Damascene, is, however, new to us.

'Some then, have imagined Paradise one of sense, others of intellect. But it seems to me, that, as man was created sensitive at the same time and intellectual, so also his most sacred home was at the same time sensitive and intellectual, and one that possessed a double expression. For in the body man dwelt in the divinest and most beautiful spot; but in the soul he abode in a higher and incomparable and far more beautiful place, having as his home God indwelling in him, having Him a glorious covering, and being endued with His grace; and, as another angel, feasting on the alone sweetest fruit of His contemplation, and being fed thereby.'

Without at all wishing to pre-judge the case, we may remark that it seems a fair question whether *some* of the authors who have employed S. Augustin's language may not have meant, as he did, to imply the existence of a literal sense beneath the allegorical.

We now pass over several chapters (which meet, however, with our cordial approbation) and arrive at the eighteenth, which treats of Predestination. On this question Mr. Owen inclines towards Augustinianism to a degree that somewhat surprises us. Can we ask the reader's attention for a short time while we try to explain our position, and the grounds of our differences from Churchmen who think with Mr. Owen?

We begin, then, thus. The greatest theologians of our time (and there is no substantial difference on this point between England and Rome) hold and teach the existence of two co-ordinate truths; viz. God's over-ruling Sovereignty, man's free agency. How these two truths can be reconciled they are almost content to leave, without even an attempt at solution. Nor does philosophy seem to speak differently from theology. Sir William Hamilton, in his 'Discussions,' arrives at the same conclusion as has here been enunciated, and confirms his statements by extracts from the works of accredited divines.

It would be quite consistent with such tenets as these to hold the lawfulness, and even the duty, of enforcing one or the other

¹ Sum. Theol. Pars I. Qu. CIL. Art. I.

of these truths the more strongly, with a special reference to times and circumstances. On any person, or set of persons, who should be inclined to trust too exclusively to what had been wrought and is being wrought for them, it may be requisite to press the need of man's co-operation, to say in the words of the Apostle, 'Work out your own salvation,' though it be 'with fear and trembling.' On those who might be in danger of undue reliance in their own strength, it may be needful to urge more forcibly the conclusion of the text, 'For it is God that worketh in you both to will and to do of His good pleasure.'

Those, however, who would fain, under all circumstances, press the Augustinian views of the Divine predestination might probably argue somewhat as follows. Here is a view taught by one who is confessedly the greatest Doctor of the West. It is in the main, though with some modification, the teaching of Aquinas and of many leading schoolmen. In the English Church it is deeply impressed upon her articles and homilies. On the Continent, not only did it exercise immense influence over Protestant Reformers, but it was likewise the cardinal principle of a movement which has many peculiar claims upon our sympathy. Fragrance still breathes from the vanished walls of Port Royal: such names as those of De Sacy, of the *Mère Angélique*, of Anne Geneviève de Longueville, are cherished with affectionate remembrance by even French *littérateurs*, such as M. Victor Cousin, and by many Englishmen, such as Sir James Stephen, Isaac Taylor, Mr. Beard, and others. Above all, the works of Pascal must be considered as a part of the common literature of Christendom.

All this we admit. Nevertheless it sounds to us like a collection of half-truths. Let us comment on the case in a reverse order, and begin with the Port-Royalists. However admirable may have been their work against the false and dangerous casuistry of the Jesuits, it does not therefore follow that their own maxims upon the doctrine of grace were entirely sound. Those who would lay stress upon splendid names must not forget such Jesuit ones as Francis Xavier, Francis Borgia, or the learned commentator Cornelius à Lapide. Bossuet is not a person whose judgment can be treated lightly, and Bossuet seems to have been inclined to defend that great bugbear of Jansenism, the treatise of Molina, *De liberi arbitrii cum gratiæ donis concordia*. In truth, these two great parties have always seemed to us to be strong in the attack. Jansenism successfully attacked the Jesuit casuistry. Jesuitism in turn was by no means wholly unsuccessful in its onslaught upon Jansenist views of grace.¹

¹ The following extract from the letters of a fervent Jansenist lady, Madame de Sévigné, may give some idea of the tone of lay supporters of the cause:—

Then, again, though it be true that the Articles and Homilies of the English Church put prominently forward the Augustinian side of these profound and difficult questions, it must not be forgotten that the other side, that of man's free agency, is to the full as prominent in the Prayer-book, and strongly implied in the sacramental and quasi-sacramental services. Moreover to the general argument deducible from our formularies, from the schoolmen, and from the fathers, there is room, if we are not mistaken, for the following general reply.

Neither particular phrases, nor particular tenets can ever hold precisely the same place in theology, when once it has been discovered by experience that they are liable to any serious abuse. It is not always enough to say *abusus non tollit usum*; if it can be shown that there is constantly exhibited in the particular case in hand a fatal facility in the progress from the one to the other. Many a phrase employed innocently and unsuspectingly before the rise of Eutychianism or Pelagianism was dropped, so soon as the Church perceived the dangerous sense of which it was capable. In like manner, the teaching of S. Augustin on predestination, though (up to a certain point) most valuable and necessary as a protest against every form of Pelagianism, cannot, we humbly submit, be regarded in exactly the same light as before, since the rise of that system of religion which bears the name of the Genevese reformer. Calvinism has shown what *may be* made of the Augustinian tenets on the Divine sovereignty; how they may tend, if unbalanced, to the overthrow of all sacramental doctrine; how perilous they *may* become to all true conceptions of the Divine attributes; how frequently they have been found to merge into Arianism and

"Is it not God who gives us the object and desire of belonging to Him? It is 'that which is crowned; it is God who crowns His gifts; if that is what you mean by *free will*, ah! I fully admit it. Jesus Christ has Himself said; "I know my 'sheep; I will lead them forth Myself, I will lose none of them. . . . I have 'chosen you, ye have not chosen me." I find a thousand passages of this 'character; I listen to them all; and when I read the contrary, I say: *it is because 'they wished to speak popularly* (communément); it is as when we say, God hath 'repented Himself; *that He is angry*, etc.; it is because they speak to men. I 'hold to this first and great truth, which is all Divine.' We can hardly wonder that De Maistre should lay hold of such writing as this, as he does in his '*L'Eglise Gallicane*,' where he argues that we might just as well lay hold of all texts that speak of God's *pardon* of sins, and declare that those which tell of His punishment of sin, of the unpardonable sin, etc., must be modified and explained away by these former ones. In an earlier paragraph of this same letter, or a similar one, Madame de Sevigné avows that 'there is no Justice except His will.' Now place this proposition before Hooker, Butler, and Clarke: they would all condemn it as unreservedly as the Jesuits. They would all say, 'God wills this or that, because it is just:' not 'this and that is just because He wills it.' They would all condemn the paradox of Ockham, 'that God could make it our duty to hate Him.' It is worth noticing that Dr. Johnson thought the Jesuits had the better case in these points.

Socinianism; how they have endangered the faith of numbers by presenting religion in so terrific a form, so devoid of all consolation, in short so utterly one-sided, as to create a deep-seated despair, and too often actual insanity.

Is this language too strong? We think not. Let us cull a few words descriptive of this teaching from one who has been in a measure nurtured in its traditions, and who does the fullest justice to the loftiness, the sincerity, the earnest devotedness of the teachers themselves.

'Dr. Hopkins in many places distinctly recognises the fact, that the greater part of the human race, up to this time, had been eternally lost, and boldly assumes the ground, that this amount of sin and suffering, being the best and most necessary means of the greatest amount of final happiness, was not merely permitted, but distinctly chosen, decreed, and provided for, as essential in the schemes of Infinite Benevolence. He held that this decree not only *permitted* each individual act of sin, but also took measures to make it certain, though, by an exercise of infinite skill, it accomplished this result without violating human free agency. . . . The sermons preached by President Edwards on this subject are so terrific in their refined poetry of torture, that very few persons of quick sensibility could read them through without agony; and it is related that when in those calm and tender tones which never rose to passionate enunciation, he read these discourses, the house was often filled with shrieks and wailings, and that a brother minister once laid hold of his skirts, exclaiming in an involuntary agony, "Oh, Mr. Edwards, Mr. Edwards, is God not a God of mercy?"

'Not that these men were indifferent or insensible to the dread words they spoke; their whole lives and deportment bore thrilling witness to their sincerity. Edwards set apart special days of fasting, in view of the dreadful doom of the lost, in which he was wont to walk the floor, weeping and wringing his hands. Hopkins fasted every Saturday. David Brainerd gave up every refinement of civilized life to weep and pray at the feet of hardened savages, if by any means he might save *one*. All, by lives of eminent purity and earnestness, gave awful weight and sanction to their words. . . . But it is to be conceded that these systems, so admirable in relation to the energy, earnestness, and acuteness of their authors, when received as absolute truth, and as a basis of actual life, had on minds of a certain class, the effect of a slow poison, producing life habits of morbid action very different from any which ever followed the simple reading of the Bible. . . . In no other place or time of Christendom have so fearful issues been presented to the mind. Some Church interposed its protecting shield; the Christian-born and baptized child was supposed in some wise rescued from the curse of the fall, and related to the great redemption—to be a member of Christ's family, and, if ever so sinful, still enfolded in some vague sphere of hope and protection. Augustin solaced the dread anxieties of trembling love by prayers offered for the dead, in times when the Church above and on earth presented itself to the eye of the mourner as a great assembly with one accord lifting interceding hands for the parted soul.

But the clear logic and intense individualism of New England, deepened the problems of the Augustinian faith, while they swept away all those softening provisions so earnestly clasped to the throbbing heart of that great poet of theology. No rite, no form, no paternal relation, no faith or prayer of Church earthly or heavenly, interposed the slightest shield between the trembling spirit and

Eternal Justice. The individual entered eternity alone, as if he had no interceding relation in the universe.¹

Although this sketch proceeds from the pen of a lady, and is introduced in the course of a tale, we see no reason to doubt its perfect correctness in the main. But if even in the hands of such sincere men this teaching had 'on minds of a certain class the effects of a slow poison,' what would it become when taught by men of less lofty principle? It would, almost inevitably, lead to a most grievous hypocrisy. Mrs. Stowe does not point this out; but another writer of the same land, Nathaniel Hawthorne, seems to have felt it deeply. We believe that the intense (we really trust excessive and undue) conviction of a vast amount of hypocrisy which is conspicuous in the 'Scarlet Letter' and in 'Mosses from an Old Manse,' arises from the circumstance that the author was brought up amidst these same Calvinistic traditions. Is there a land where Calvinism is rampant, that does not, proportionally, and side by side with earnestness, witness a vast development of hypocrisy?

Now Mr. Owen takes by far the greater part of his chapter on predestination, and *the whole* of his chapter on election straight out of the works of S. Augustin. Even if our objections to the Augustinian view appeared in the fifth century or before the Reformation, we maintain that some even among his contemporaries were dissatisfied. 'Cassian and 'other leading Churchmen at Marseilles, and throughout the 'south of Gaul,—including Hilary, who had recently been 'appointed to the primatial see of Arles, and was eminent for 'devotion, pastoral zeal, and theological ability—took serious 'exceptions to Augustin's predestinarian rigour. . . . Cassian 'and his friends admitted original sin and real grace. But they 'did not admit an absolute predestination of a fixed number of 'persons, not based on foresight of their perseverance, but 'making perseverance certain for them, and impossible for all 'beside. They denounced this teaching on moral grounds, as 'fatalistic in its tendencies, inciting to carelessness, and discouraging exertion. They insisted on God's offers of mercy 'to all men; on the universality of baptism; on the unlimited 'efficacy of the death of Christ.'² It is admitted in the valuable work from which we take these words, that *some* were led through their zeal for man's responsibility to take up untenable ground, and thus lapse into Semi-Pelagianism. But this error on the part of *some* does not militate against the im-

¹ The Minister's Wooing.

² Bright's History of The Church, A.D. 313—451 (p. 308).

portance and value of the general protest. 'Augustine, by his own showing, did not acknowledge, on man's part, a real freedom of will; on God's, a real readiness to have mercy upon all men. The truths for which the Gallicans were solicitous appeared in their due place, clear of all semi-Pelagian error, in the admirable dogmatic statements of a Gallican council held a century later, in 529, at Orange. That assembly scanned the mystery of grace and free-will on both sides; and while glorifying God as the inspirer of all prayer and faith, proclaimed that all the baptized, having received grace through baptism, could, by the co-operating aid of Christ, work out their own salvation.'¹ It is only fair to add that many of the canons of this council were sentences taken out of the works of S. Augustin and S. Prosper.

We have only room for a slight discussion of the remaining chapters of the work before us, and shall accordingly select, as most interesting, the topics of the Holy Eucharist and the Communion of Saints.

On the presence of our Lord in His own chief Sacrament, our author speaks much as Mr. Palmer in his 'Treatise on the Church.' 'It is a duty of common candour,' writes Mr. Owen, 'to exhibit the uniform and unwavering testimony borne by antiquity to the real and objective presence of Christ in the eucharist, under the forms or species of bread and wine.' (P. 414.) Any points of difference which may exist between us and our author on this head would probably be found to be of a purely metaphysical, or, perhaps, even merely verbal character. We pass on, therefore, to the question of the Sacrifice.

And here we cannot help regretting that Mr. Owen has not brought out more strongly what seems to us the immense difference between the argument on behalf of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, and that for the Invocation of Saints; namely, that the former has a scriptural basis and the latter has not. Let us suppose a preacher or commentator, who pays any respect to the voice of the early Church, to be explaining the meaning of Malachi i. 11. Thomas Scott passes it quietly *sub silentio*; but then he did not pretend to echo the teaching of the Fathers. As, however, no question can be more natural and proper than this, 'Has this prophecy been fulfilled, or not?' we turn for satisfaction to some work from which we can obtain a reply. We take down, let us say, a volume of the learned Joseph Mede, and read as follows:—

¹ Bright, *ubi supra*.

'This place of Scripture, howsoever now in a manner silenced and forgotten, was once, and that in the oldest and purest time of the Church, a text of eminent note, and familiarly known to every Christian, being alleged by their pastors and teachers, as an express and undoubted prophecy of the Christian Sacrifice or solemn worship in the Eucharist, taught by our blessed Saviour unto His disciples, to be observed of all that should believe in His name; and this so generally and grantedly, as could never have been, at least so early, unless they had learnt thus to apply it by tradition from the Apostles.

'For in the age immediately succeeding them, it being the second hundred of years after Christ, we find it alleged to this purpose by Justin Martyr and Irenæus, the pillars of the age; the former of them flourishing within little more than thirty years after the death of St. John; and the latter, a disciple of Polycarp, St. John's scholar. In the age following, or third *seculum*, it is alleged by Tertullian, Zeno Veronensis, and Cyprian: in the fourth *seculum* by Eusebius, Chrysostom, Hierom, and Augustine: and in the after ages, by whom not? Nor is it alleged by them as a singular opinion or private conceit of their own, but as the received tradition of the Church; whence in some Liturgies (as that of the Church of Alexandria, commonly called the Liturgy of St. Mark) it is inserted into the Hymn or Preface, which begins Ἀληθὺς ὁ Θεὸς ἐστὶ καὶ δίκαιος—"It is truly meet and right;" the conclusion of the hymn or laud there being, "Giving thanks we offer unto Thee, O Lord, this "reasonable and unbloody service, even that which all nations from the rising of "the sun to the going down of the same offer unto Thee; for Thy Name shall "be great among all nations; and in every place incense is offered unto Thy "Holy Name, and sacrifice and oblation."

Or again, let us suppose our expositor to dwell upon the language of S. Paul, in 1 Corinthians x. 16—21. What means this sudden transition from the Eucharist to the sacrifices of the law, and to the sacrifices of the heathen? As in the case of the former text, popular expositors pass it by. But to those who look closely into the matter, we can conceive no satisfactory explanation, excepting that the transition is perfectly natural, for this simple reason: that the Holy Eucharist *is* the Christian sacrifice, and may therefore properly admit, in this respect, of a comparison with the sacrificial rites of both Judaism and Paganism.

There are many passages of Holy Writ, as for example the accounts of the Institution, which point in the same direction. But, for the Invocation of departed Saints, what possible Scripture can be found? All the ingenuity of Estius can only discover one; and that one can hardly, we imagine, be thought capable of bearing any serious examination. It is the cry of the rich man, being in torments, to Abraham (S. Luke xvi. 24). Surely this mysterious narrative establishes nothing with respect to the duties of the living; to say nothing of the fact, that such an argument, if pressed home, would prove too much, as it would tend to make for invocation on the part of the lost. Nor do we believe that it is possible to adduce any primitive authority whatever on behalf of such an interpretation. How different from the evidence just cited from Mede upon the passage in Malachi.

We are not, be it observed, assuming that Mr. Owen would have any serious difference with us upon this score. All that we assert is, that the distinction, though implied in some of the general principles laid down at the outset of this book, is not here carried out in detail.

The intercession of departed Saints for us stands upon different ground. Not only is the miserable doctrine of the sleep of the soul anti-Scriptural and condemned by all primitive authority, but the remarkable language of S. John (Apoc. vi. 9—11) seems clearly to intimate that they pray for us. 'If,' writes Bishop Pearson, 'if we cut off all intercession of angels and saints for us living on earth, and striving with the host of evil spirits—if we acknowledge no power at all before the throne of God, of the martyrs who poured forth their lives for Christ, —if all those who venerated their remains are by us rejected, scouted, and branded as idolaters, . . . what that Church may be with which we can hold communion, I am altogether ignorant.'¹

We must here close our survey of Mr. Owen's pages. The work has, we imagine, made less impression than its real merits deserve. We say not this as if we were blind to some defects. These have been pointed out in our remarks on our author's treatment of such subjects as the Divine attributes, and predestination. We must add, that, though the passages for translation are well chosen and well rendered, there is room for criticism of Mr. Owen's style, when he is communicating his own thoughts. The extract, for example, which we have given from his sixth chapter, admirable as it is in tone, is certainly open to some objection in point of expression.

But it is not from its defects that this volume lies comparatively unheeded. Its learning, its honesty and fairness, its stores of information, ought to be more than sufficient to counter-balance these. It is neglected, because its subject-matter is not in fashion.

We cannot afford to re-write all our reasons against such neglect, nor again to fortify those reasons by the support given on the one hand by such writers as Professor Ellicott, on the other by Mr. Buckle and the Westminster Reviewers. Enough for the present to regret an error which, if often rebuked by unexpected allies, is often on the other hand fostered by unlooked-for opponents.

¹ Minor Works, Ed. Churton, Vol. II. pp. 54, 55. The translation is by the late Dr. Mill, 'Sermons on the Nature of Christianity,' p. 52. We the rather quote the passage, because Mr. Owen writes as if he were not aware of its existence, and gives an extract, much less to the point, from the Bishop's work on the Creed.

Thus, for instance, we have heard it said by able men, and seen it in print from able pens, that to admit theology to be a science, implies the possibility of some utter change passing over it. Those who speak thus are, we suspect, thinking of inductive sciences alone. But the triumphs of physical philosophy must not induce us to forget that there are such things as deductive sciences likewise. Differing as we do *toto cælo* from Mr. Buckle (who preaches mere theism and disbelieves in revelation), we perfectly agree with him in classing theology with the deductive sciences. Now, in such sciences it is perfectly possible that enlargement of their range should prove compatible with the existence of unshaken foundations. Thus, in mathematics (which are generally allowed to be the best type of a deductive science) the marvellous powers of analysis conferred by the invention of the differential calculus do not render Euclid's 'Elements of Geometry' untrue. In like manner, not all that criticism, history, philology, and metaphysics can accomplish towards the elucidation of divine truth, has yet been found really to militate against the doctrines enshrined in the creeds; and we venture to affirm that it never will.

But we turn to a more individualised attack upon dogmatic theology. The Professor of Modern History at Oxford has entered upon a course of argument against positivism. We rejoice at this; for not only would it be difficult to find an abler opponent of this pernicious phase of thought, but the same arguments coming from a layman, and one known to be what is called a liberal, will be listened to with far more willingness and produce a much greater effect than they possibly could if they were enunciated in publications such as the reader has now before him. But honesty is a primary duty, and it would not be honest for us to accept the aid, even of one for whose character and abilities we have such sincere respect, if in so doing we were supposed to make our own such extraordinary statements as that part of the following passage which we italicise:—

'State churches, whatever relation they may bear to Christianity, are not of its essence, *any more than sacerdotalism, sacramentalism, dogmatism, or other additions which were unknown to the first disciples of Christ.* If Christianity is to be arraigned as an enemy to reason and improvement, we must put ourselves in the position of listeners to the Sermon on the Mount, and regard the original essence as a new principle of action, and a new source of spiritual life.'¹

Now we utterly decline, for the present, to consider the possibility of the absence of sacramentalism from that religion whose Divine Founder sealed it with the most solemn of sacra-

¹ The Study of History. Two Lectures delivered by Goldwin Smith, M.A. Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Oxford. Preface. 1861.

ments, and specially revealed the rite to that apostle who, being 'as one born out of due time,' was not present to witness it; from that religion concerning which that same apostle wrote, 'as many as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ.' We utterly decline, for the present, to argue against the perverted views of Bunsen and Neander respecting the Christian priesthood; a priesthood which stands or falls with the reality of the great gift in the eucharist. But as for a *Christianity without dogmatism* we must take the opportunity of repeating our solemn conviction, that it never has existed, and never will exist; that the phrase itself is little better than nonsense. Christianity without dogmatism! Why, not one even of the false religions, which really live and energize, could exist for an hour without dogmatism. Show us a Mahometanism that flourishes without proclaiming the dogmas of the Unity of the Godhead and the apostleship of Mahomet; show us a Buddhism which does not teach the mystic dogma of absorption, known as Nirvana; show us a Brahmanism that knows nothing of the dogmas of incarnations of Vishnu and revelation in Vedas, and then—but not before—you may hope to make us believe in the existence of a Christianity without dogmatism.

But we are to 'put ourselves,' says Professor Goldwin Smith, 'in the position of listeners to the Sermon on the Mount.' Now, most assuredly, it is not among theologians of the patristic school that that divine discourse will meet with any want of reverent study. Canon Wordsworth, in his edition of the Greek Testament, gives references to authors, ancient and modern, 'for an exposition of this Sermon, and its fruits in human society.' Dean Trench has devoted a special volume to the teaching of S. Augustine upon it. Dr. Moberly has recently issued a course of Sermons on the Beatitudes. We might easily enlarge the list.

Nevertheless, to see even the Sermon on the Mount singled out in this manner seems strange. An author, not long since criticised in this Review, has talked of the whole of Apostolic Christianity being contained in a single text. The Professor of Modern History does not venture to impose such a limitation as this. But the principle involved is the same, and in either instance we equally demur it.

'We must put ourselves in the position of listeners to the Sermon on the Mount.' And why not of listeners to the discourses recorded by S. John? Is the Professor prepared to say that these last may not be, in their own way, as important as the former? It is true that we may in this latter case find it somewhat difficult to escape from the pressure of that sacramentalism and dogmatism, which are here represented as additions

to the doctrine of Christ. But unless we intend to select for ourselves what portions of the Holy Gospels we will accept, and what reject, these problems must be fairly faced.

Nor is this the only difficulty which, in our humble judgment, besets the view of this gifted and accomplished writer. Let us try for a moment (so far as it is possible) to follow his advice literally.

We listen, then, to those eight Beatitudes, which have been termed *quasi octo Christi paradoxa*; and shortly after we hear the following words: 'Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil.' Here is surely a clear recognition of a dogma; namely, the divine authority of the law and the prophets. Now this is one of Gibbon's stumbling-blocks. He complains of the Reformers that (like their Roman Catholic opponents), 'with the Jews they adopted the belief and defence of all the Hebrew Scriptures.'¹ Nor is this all. As the speaker utters these words, and then proceeds *emphatically* to contrast the older precepts with his spiritualized expansions and modifications, the question *must* inevitably arise in the mind: 'Who is this that dares to place Himself on a level with the law delivered of old?' 'But I say unto you (*Εγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν*)?' The Church's answer is simple and obvious. He, and He alone, who gave the law can possess authority thus to modify and enlarge it. What Professor Goldwin Smith says, we do not know: but even with his abilities, he would, we suspect, find it extremely difficult to give any clear and intelligible reply without trenching upon his profession of 'Christianity without dogmatism.'

To return, however, to the volume before us. If the author of such a work can, in these days, hope for comparatively few readers only; it does not the less remain true that those few become in their turn instructors of many, and that most influentially. It is not easy, in days of laxity and misbelief, to overrate the influence exercised by those who know distinctly what they hold, and why they hold it. Teachers, thus fortified, find welcome listeners, even when their system is that of a narrow Calvinism: much more may we hope for a full and lasting blessing upon their labours, when their range of theology embraces so wide, and yet so well divided and marked-out a territory, as that of primitive Catholic theology.

Among the checks to that spirit of worldliness which embraces us on every side, and whose presence must often startle those who are at all watchful over themselves, is certainly to be reckoned the study of theology. This is true of all its branches.

¹ Decline and Fall. Chap. liv. *versus fin.*

Yet, without detracting from the merit of other branches (such as exegetical or moral theology) in this respect, it is really possible that to a certain class of minds, and that a lofty one, dogmatic theology may appeal with a charm and force peculiarly its own. It may, of course, sink into coldness, formalism, and aridity, or seek to be wise above that which is written: but to admit the possibility of such fatal error is only to admit that students, even of the holiest themes, are men. Nor, indeed, are the other departments of the science in any wise free from their own peculiar dangers. What moral theology *may* become, we see in bad and dishonest works of casuistry; what *exegesis* may become, we see in the works of German expositors, and, alas! in volumes nearer home. The long list of dogmatic theologians must be admitted, even by those who have little taste for such studies, to include abundance of all that is heroic in action and devotional in temper of mind. It is something for the humblest pursuer of such investigations to be joining himself to a band that contains such names as those of Athanasius, Leo, John of Damascus, Peter Lombard, Aquinas, Bradwardine, Pearson, Möhler, Mill. And our free exposition of whatever seems to us defective or one-sided in Mr. Owen's volume must not be supposed to lessen our gratitude for a publication of so much thought and learning, which few, if any, can lay down without having added to their stores of knowledge on the most momentous themes that can engage the attention of the human mind, nor without having often been carried away in thought from things of earth,

‘To where beyond these voices there is peace.’

- ART. IX.—1. *Kaiserwerth Deaconesses.* Masters.
 2. *The First Ten Years of the House of Mercy, Clewer.* Masters.
 3. *Thoughts on Religious Communities, or Letters of two Friends.* Masters.
 4. *The Constitutions of the Guild of S. Alban.* Masters.
 5. *Hospitals and Sisterhoods.* John Murray.
 6. *Church Deaconesses.* J. H. and J. Parker.
 7. *The Oxford Churchman's Union.* 1st Report. Oxford: Vincent.
 8. *Historical Sketch of English Brotherhoods.* Masters.
 9. *Josiah Woodward's Rise and Progress of Religious Societies of London.* Published 1712.

It is probable that the heading of this essay will raise but a confused suggestion as to its contents. The schemes of religious combination are now proportionably numerous and varied, as the principle itself is, in this country, new and untried. Amid pressing demands for work to be done, and the almost overpowering sense of how much has been left undone, we resort to the principle of association, as at least the most promising remedy. It is the observation of Bunsen that the principle of association, in religious matters especially, is one of 'the universal and significant characteristics of the age.' ('Signs of the Times,')

However this may be, under the particular circumstances of this Church and country, there is no cause of wonder that something like united feeling and united effort should be awakened. Independently of the fact that this principle has so long been utterly dormant in the Church, and therefore must eventually vindicate itself, the well-known state of religion in this country is such as to raise the most serious doubts whether some important resources in our Christian warfare may not lie hidden as yet amid the prejudices and worldliness which have encompassed us. We do not say that the Church of England has done less to commend itself to the masses, as they are called, than other Churches. In all ages, and in all countries, the consistent professors of religion have been a scanty minority. The History of the Church is but an expansion of the prophetic parable of the seed-sower: but though we may admit that no new thing has happened to us, it is always our duty to see whether any especial defects in our organization have contributed to any especial failures. One deficiency in our parochial system seems to be prominent.

No one can read the assertion lately published by the Additional Curates' Society, that in thirty-four of our great towns, fifty-two per cent. attend no place of worship whatever, without the thought, that surely some fresh organization might at least be tried; while, if the inquirer proceed further in the subject, the former report will tell him, that the average number of people to each clergyman in parts of the metropolis is about 5,000; of sittings available for the poor, in some of the richest parishes, about one to every twenty. Let him further ask of clerical friends engaged in our larger cities, and he will discover that there are cases which have failed to invite the assistance of any but the home missionaries of dissent, where the nominal charge of 15,000 or 20,000 has been committed to a single man. From such data as these, it was calculated in a recent report of Convocation, that at the end of this century the number of practical heathen in our large towns will be raised to 74 per cent.

In attempting to deal with this subject, we have to meet also a second difficulty: there are no precedents by which to try and to compare the methods which come under our notice; designs of the most opposite character drawn from Protestant Germany and from the Roman Catholic orders of charity have, by turns, excited the public mind.¹ But of schemes of practical self-devotion the Church of England presents no authorized standard; we might catalogue our schools and hospitals, and show an honourable list, but when we look for personal sacrifice and Christian labour, but little offers itself beyond the service of the hireling or the individual efforts of a few, whose names are justly cherished but whose example has never been elevated into subsequent system and permanent institution.

In attempting, therefore, to gather up the varied efforts which are now being made, into some more general and persistent form, we must deal with most as isolated portions of our Church's future, rather than as institutions which have won the character of tried usefulness. The increased earnestness of the present day has, by God's mercy, suggested the solution of a

¹ For thirty years past the *Béguines* of Flanders, and the *Sœurs de la Charité* of France, have been referred to in popular publications on the social condition of England.

The '*Hospitals and Sisterhoods*' cites a valuable extract from Sir J. K. Shuttleworth, urging a '*Protestant Diaconate*' to be raised from the lay orders of Communicants.

The English Woman's Journal, a periodical employed in the discovery of the due part of women in the world, frequently urges the associated principle. For the last few years, the Kaiserwerth institution has furnished the most widely spread idea of combined religious work, at least for women. An order of nurses to be trained upon that model was contemplated by Sir E. Parry for the Haslar Hospital, but totally failed.

mighty problem, which for three hundred years has been only faintly entertained; we mean religious associations for charitable labour; a problem which, as we will endeavour to prove, is as closely connected with the cultivation of personal holiness throughout the Church, as it is with the stemming of the torrent of vice and impiety, which is yearly gaining on our neglected multitudes.

Though the basis of religious associations may be extremely various, the main object of those which are in the present day attempted, is that of practical charity. The interesting little work, 'Hospitals and Sisterhoods,' arose from an inspection of the hospitals of this country. The result of extensive inquiry and correspondence was, that so far was any religious impression from being regularly aimed at, that not even outward tenderness of manner and treatment could be secured for the sufferers. The writer then put out the idea of so educating the nurses as to enable them to act in subordination to the chaplain; but this was responded to on all sides by the assurance of its impossibility; the character of persons supplying the office of nurse being often destitute of even moral principle. Some were altogether abandoned, while, to fill the inferior posts, the lowest class of charwomen had to be called in. In the 'Thoughts on Religious Communities' there is the same motive, though more broadly entertained.

'Think of our closely crowded cities, and of the hundreds within them of sick, and suffering, and dying, with no one to minister to their bodily necessities, none to whisper consoling words of the "land very far off," and of that blessed and awful day when he shall see the King in His glory. Think of the little children, each possessing an immortal soul, growing up in ignorance and vice, going daily further from God and Heaven. I cannot pursue the picture—our penitentiaries, our workhouses, our prisons, all crowd before me. Why are my words so cold?'

An appeal from the Pasteur Vermeil in support of the Protestant Sisterhood in Paris, founded in 1841, is made in the following words:—

'The master calls you: He calls you to serve Him in serving His Church and His poor. You desire to give yourself to Him? Well then, you will find Him in the poor that you relieve, the sinner that you console, the sick that you nurse, and the child that you receive in His name, and what service is so sweet as that of the Saviour?'

In a statement of the 'Principles and Objects' of the Guild of S. Alban, the list of practical works contains:—

'Visiting the heathen, distressed, sick, hospitals, gaols, workhouses, &c.'

The Confraternity of the Holy Cross presents us with the following 'Spiritual works of Mercy; Instructing the Ignorant,

'Giving Friendly Council, Converting Sinners, Consoling the Afflicted.'

We quote these only for the purpose of showing what is the prominent object common to all.

In furtherance then of this main purpose, the designs which come under our review naturally separate themselves into two classes. Firstly, those which are irregular in operation, because their agents, as they claim no pecuniary support, cannot devote more than a small section of their time and energy. Secondly, those which secure to their members a common home, and claim in return the entire devotion of their powers, so long, at least, as their connexion with the society lasts. The complete conventual idea, implying a service for life, we believe has found no footing in this country. Even in the 'Thoughts on Religious Communities,' exaggerated as parts are, the restriction of perpetual vows is distinctly set aside.

In the latter class of associations we have made little substantial progress. In some, error and enthusiasm have been too closely connected with self-devotion; about all, public suspicion is as yet keen and watchful.

The late Bishop of London is quoted as expressing himself, 'deeply anxious for the establishment of female institutions, where the energies of mind and body should be devoted to the service of Christ, yet regretting that he had seen one institution after another, established for this object, fail.' (Hospitals and Sisterhoods, p. 51.)

Yet the diocese of Oxford affords three instances, the silent but progressive success of one being perhaps the best testimony to the goodness of the cause generally; these are based too upon the most trying principle of gratuitous service from persons occupying the higher ranks of life.¹ The diocese of Exeter of course suggests the memory of the first of these efforts, one to which gratitude is due on the ground of courage and originality, though we would draw a veil over its later course. There are also the germs of two other associations. Bussage presents us with another, and one connected with the cherished name of Bishop Armstrong, the earliest mover in the penitentiary cause.

¹ From Mr. Carter's account we find that in 1859 there were twenty-five regular resident sisters at Clewer. During the first five years sixty-seven penitents had passed through the institution. The Oxford and Wantage Institutions are smaller. The Devonport sisterhood is sufficiently strong to maintain the following objects:—An orphan home, receiving twenty-seven; a school for sailor boys, with twenty-six; a home for destitute girls, containing twelve; another for old sailors; an industrial school which gives employment to 120 young women; lodging-houses for poor families, containing 160; also for young women; a ragged and evening school, with seventy; a home for destitute children, and soup-kitchens. Besides these there are connected institutions in London and Bristol.

London has six or seven ; that of All Saints being, as Clewer, immediately under episcopal sanction and visitation, and destined we trust to share a like portion of credit. A few more might be added, but the list soon closes ; and one cannot help the thought, if these institutions are among the permanent desiderata of the Church, how long a time must elapse, at the present rate of progress, ere they are planted through the country ?

Notwithstanding the admirable constitutions of Clewer and All Saints, we think that eventually it must be found necessary to embrace within the existing system a plan of indirect payment, by the provision of a home during the active years of life, and a quiet refuge in age. Such is the case at Kaiserwerth, which alone numbers 240 Sisters, and in all the fifteen kindred Protestant institutions of which the Pastor Hiedner has given a report.

Doubtless there is more to admire in our own institutions, where there is nothing to gain, and all, in a worldly point of view, to lose, by those who join them ; but it seems unlikely, until the door is open to a lower class of persons, that they can ever be sufficiently numerous. And this does in fact seem contemplated by Mr. Carter, who proposes possibly to retain in service for the establishment some who have gone through its penitential course. In the Sisterhood of S. Vincent de Paul, the most extensive and useful association of the kind that exists, the highly educated, whose work of charity is spiritual instruction, whether in the hospital or the parish, are relieved of menial duties by those who enter the society from a lower position. These number about 12,000, spread over most of the countries of Europe, besides America. Upon this subject the imaginary correspondent in 'the Letters of the two Friends' remonstrates that much of the work assigned to our Lady Sisters of Charity might be as well done by 'servant-maids.'

We can fully applaud that self-sacrifice which will apply the highest powers of mind and education where the work can be best done by such resources ; but in large institutions, there must be many offices which can be honestly and faithfully filled by the class to whom Providence has assigned them, and surely to employ these for the stipulated reward of a secure home and a religious life would violate no principle. At any rate, if this system is worked with such effect in Germany, where the Protestant deaconesses number already 430, why not in England ?

To put the question in a more palpable form, we may say that there are estimated to be 25,000 persons employed in the work of attending the sick ; why should not these be trained to it as a religious duty, and authorized by the Church to carry the consolations of religion as part of their professional office ?

We cannot see the inconsistency of two distinct grades being connected with one establishment; there will be abundant duties for both, duties which will sufficiently intermingle to strengthen the ties which a common home and a common daily worship would necessarily create. We suppose that their chance of maintenance from the country would be equal to that of the Scripture readers (where they were useful there they would be supported). They might be sent out upon their service with more ease than women from the higher orders generally could be. No person who understands the needs of the poor would fail to recognise the blessings of such an agency, which, in the asylums of Germany or the villages of France, has been so effective. We have known the attempt several times made to establish a parish nurse; we cannot say that we have ever known it satisfactorily carried out. There would be others also, besides the nursing sister, to rally round such institutions, were the sacredness of humble office in the Church better realized, and any method of training set on foot.

We should notice here, as a grateful token of the voluntary system of charity, the Workhouse Visiting Society. This is a movement which may, in due time, awaken as much sympathy as the penitentiaries have done within the last few years. It is abundantly needed. Scarcely any point of social degradation can be more striking, than the fact that our workhouses, the most extensive of our national charities, have been but a stage above the prisons; and this not only in the prejudices of those who enter them, but in their actual management. We cannot understand why there should be such difficulties as are asserted in the way of their better regulation. 'It is impossible,' says the Bishop of London, 'to bestow that kindly treatment, founded on Christian sympathy, in large establishments, where the inmates are numbered by hundreds.' From the supposed difficulty, however, has emanated a design which we are thankful to recognise: namely, an industrial home for young women, to be drafted from the workhouses, according to character, and above fifteen years of age. This home is now in operation; candidates for admission are required to be supported by weekly payments, and it is intended, that in cases of emergency or sickness in after-years, they may return.

At the same time, it is to be hoped that the Visiting Society for the Workhouses may effect an improvement in the institutions themselves. One would suppose, that, once admitted, the inmates can be placed under the fullest control; that a little charitable discernment might separate the better-minded from the impure and ruffianly society to which they are frequently exposed; that in the sick-ward some better supervision might

be carried out, both as to the comforts of the sufferers, and their intercourse among themselves. But this can never be effected by mere mercenary service, irrespective of proper training, or real love and pity towards the poor, suffering, and unfortunate.

Here, however, we have strayed beyond the limits of our first division, for this society of voluntary visitors must depend upon the fluctuating tastes and occasional impulses of those who fill its ranks; it approaches more nearly to the undefined office of the District Visitor, bound by no rules, and following no precise method.

But as we have almost exhausted this subject, so far as female work has to be regarded, we may add, in conclusion, the excellent institution of an unattached order of helpers connected with the regular Homes of Charity. These pay occasional visits only to the houses which they have undertaken to aid, the links of interest being in the meantime perpetuated by collecting alms, providing situations for penitents, and the sale of work. The *Sœurs de la Charité* have similar associated members, and no method seems so likely to spread throughout the country an interest in these institutions.

Our duty now is to give some idea of the working of certain less compacted societies, the growth and multiplication of which the few last years have witnessed. And here we are introduced at once to the associations in which men only are engaged. Though claiming some connexion with the religious societies of the seventeenth century (see Dr. Steere's 'Historical Sketch'), the modern imitations have not very much in common as to their aims, still less as to their constitution. These latter appear to be essentially an offshoot of the advanced Church principles of our day, and to aim at strength by combination, while the former were the reaction against an age of licence and profanity.

The Guild of S. Alban, in Dr. Steere's little work, justly occupies the first place in these revived associations. In an appeal on its behalf we read that they have, since their foundation about ten years ago, been engaged 'In works of piety and charity in various parts of England.' In the same paper they say, 'Wherever we have been well established, the following works have engaged our attention, and we have actively carried on as many as in each case we could. 1.—To establish or assist in night-schools for grown-up lads, or adults. 2.—To assist in the Sunday-schools, or to form them if not already established. 3.—Parochial visiting under the sanction and direction of the clergy. 4.—To provide decent and devout interment for the poor. 5.—To form societies and Church clubs among workmen. 6.—To assist in the

‘Church choir. 7.—To distribute alms and notices, and to perform all such other pious and charitable works as we may have any opportunity of undertaking under the guidance of the clergy.’ We find in the same account the details of their work in the way of Sunday-schools, night-schools, provident clubs open to communicants, the gathering up of unbaptized children, the dispersion of tracts, the burial of the dead in reverent and becoming manner. They have it in contemplation also to establish Sisterhoods connected with the Guild, one of which is already in operation, and subserves a general object of the society, the superintendence of a home for factory girls. In their monthly paper, ‘Church Work,’ may be read the account of good service done to the Church of every kind, in which it is possible for pious lay members to be occupied, from the sponsorship of neglected children to the counteraction of religious and political agitation. As a specimen of the reality of their work, we quote the following (p. 12, ‘Appeal, &c.’):—

‘On another occasion we were entrusted with the notices of an intended confirmation, to be distributed from house to house. We met in our rooms and said a short form of prayer together; then the parish was divided among us into small districts, and we went out, two and two, for the rest of the evening, calling at every house and ascertaining generally who were unconfirmed and what was thought by them of that holy rite. We made notes of this for the information and guidance of the clergy. We all assembled again when we had finished our labours, talked over our work, prayed together, and so went home to our rest. Those were happy evenings, and by God’s grace not uselessly occupied.’

But we must not omit to notice some peculiarities of constitution, which may account for the very sectional character which this society has assumed. The utmost deference is, by their rules, paid to the clergy, who at all times have the power of visiting, and of being present at any of their local meetings. This is conceded not only to the clergyman of the parish, but to the Bishop, Archdeacon, and Rural Dean. In the first of the declarations, enforced on the admission of fellows, each has to assert, ‘that it is my earnest desire to receive and maintain all ‘divine doctrine, and to submit myself to all truly Catholic and ‘Apostolic discipline.’ We should have thought, in consistency with such an avowal, that some general sanction of the Church, or, at least, particular episcopal sanction, would be necessary; it does not appear, however, that this is sought by the brotherhood, and we are not aware that in any diocese it has been conceded. Here is an obvious point of departure from the English brotherhoods of the seventeenth century. Archbishop Tenison and Bishop Stillingfleet gave them their fullest patronage.

Neither is the Guild of S. Alban on any occasion assembled to receive admonition or encouragement from any spiritual director, another essential feature of the older societies.

We must also observe upon the positive declaration of faith required of the fellows. It cannot be said to be against the belief of any honest Churchman, but the fact of its requirement in the place of simple adhesion to our existing formularies, does suggest something peculiar in the character of the Guild. The impression, we think, cannot be resisted that there is too much of the active and external, and too little of the personal and contemplative, to form a perfect idea of a religious union. Amongst their rules and duties, all are required 'to cultivate personal holiness;' at the same time, there is no account made of religious conference; small sections of Holy Scripture are read alternately with writings of Fathers of the Church, or the life of S. Alban; but no word of comment or interrogation appears to be admitted. One would suppose that the story of the latter, unless some fresh archives have come into the possession of the Guild, would not bear many repetitions, or perhaps very minute criticism.

The Confraternity of the Holy Cross appears constructed on much the same plan as that of S. Alban. Its list of objects, though less copious, is nearly identical. As in the former, the general intention is to incite and direct the labours of the lay members of the Church. We cannot disguise our opinion, however, that the constitutions of this body exhibit those features of one-sided extravagance which must be the danger of every close religious society.

It might be alike presumptuous and uncharitable to criticise expressions of private devotion; we may be less scrupulous in attaching the charge of childishness to the forms of a society. The following prayer is an example:—

'O God, who hast been pleased to sanctify the standard of the life-giving Cross by the precious Blood of Thy truly-begotten Son; grant that we who delight in honouring the same holy Cross may ever rejoice in Thy protection,' &c.

Compared with the severe expression and well-defined purport of the Collects to which the English ear is accustomed, what does the meaning of this prayer really amount to? We might say as much of the rule quoted from the same manual:—

'That every member shall, on obtaining the consent of the warden, be allowed to put up a votive offering in the oratory, or furnish any article of devotion, such as an image of our Lady, or any saint,' &c.

After this, the reader will be the less surprised that not only a distinct profession of the faith is required on the admission of

each Brother, but that this comprises a belief in the Seven Sacraments, in the necessity of confession and absolution in every case of mortal sin, in the propitiatory sacrifice for the quick and dead at the altar, and in the lawfulness of asking, as well as desiring, the prayers of the Saints. The undisguised and positive statement of these tenets is somewhat startling; but it is no business of ours to debate the subject with the confraternity; we would observe only that a Society, whose object is to serve the Church by works of practical charity, is likely to find itself considerably impeded by the use of the language it has adopted. On every ground of reason and experience, it seems probable that when a religious society assumes a doctrinal attitude, so far at variance with the great body of the Church around it, the practical work of charity must soon be superseded by the necessity of battling for its own peculiarities. We have surely sufficient instances in which unscrupulous enthusiasm for an order has blinded its followers to the very principles of truth and piety.

For this reason we contend that Episcopal sanction ought at the outset to be sought by any society that would obtain the confidence of our people, or secure to itself the hope of permanent usefulness.

It may be objected that the necessary details of devotional regulation are such as would not, under present circumstances, obtain approbation in every diocese. But the well-known sympathy of Bishop Tait with the All Saints' Sisterhood is an instance to the contrary. Fully believing that only under the avowed admission of all that is catholic in doctrine and discipline these institutions can flourish, and real devotion to the work can be maintained, we have yet a full belief that fairness of consideration would be generally accorded to any scheme which bore upon its front an honest probability of practical service. Would it not in any case be better to put our faith in that grace of discernment and moderation which we rightly look for among the gifts of the Episcopal office, than to the changeful and excited temper of a body chiefly of laity, bound by no laws but what their own wisdom had suggested?

There exist also smaller societies, such as those of Almondsbury and Hatcham, framed for the same purposes of charity, and support of the Church, as the two we have mentioned. Here, likewise, the works to be undertaken comprehend the relief of the sick and poor, the conduct of schools and libraries, and all other matters in which the help of the laity is so greatly needed. We are unable to state what has been the practical working of these fraternities; but their operations being confined within the limits of their respective parishes, they furnish in one important

point the type of what we shall hereafter recommend. Only here we must again observe the over-active tendency, and the slight provision made for the increase of personal piety. Assistance in the choir, the observance of holy days, kneeling at prayer, the maintenance of Church union, frequency of Holy Communion, are insisted upon; but nothing appears in the way of mutual counsel, or any definite methods of spiritual advance. We must here give an outline of a third of these parish societies which obtained the approbation of the late Bishop of Lincoln; though, from particular circumstances, it has never been actually established. It is prefaced by the text, 'That they may be 'one; as Thou Father art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also 'may be one in Us, that the world may believe that Thou hast 'sent Me,' and the aim accordingly is private union and edification rather than external charity. Communion three times a year is the basis of membership. Each member must be proposed by others, who shall certify the candidate's desire to lead 'a godly and a Christian life:' they pledge themselves to Church attendance under penalty of exclusion. In times of sickness their duty is to communicate with members, and to give assistance in reading and instruction to others; they are bound to family prayer, at least every night. Stewards of the society collect and distribute alms. Membership with similar societies, which may exist in other parishes, is provided for by certificate. Here all rules are to be submitted to the bishop, under the primitive injunction of Ignatius, 'to do nothing apart from the bishop.' The last rule contains this important declaration as to strict allegiance to the Church on its own plain and broad principles: 'This society does not seek to form any new association apart from that "congregation of faithful men" of which the Church consists; and that the members do no more than pledge themselves to observe those things which they are already bound to observe by their Baptism and Christian profession renewed in Confirmation.'

The first annual report of the Oxford Churchman's Union announces the further progress of the principle of combination; the designs of this Union will be best understood by a copy of their first rules, with its details:—

'I. The object of this Union is to promote the close and active co-operation of Clergy and Laity, by any of the following means, or others which may be conducive to the same end:—

'By meetings for conversation and mutual improvement. By circulating books and information on subjects of interest affecting the work and condition of the Church. By holding friendly intercourse with neighbours, with due reference to the parochial system, for the purpose of encouraging young men to take a personal interest in religion.

'By instructing the ignorant.

'By taking steps to provide improved lodgings for artisans, labourers, or casual travellers.

'By Lectures, Readings, Singing Classes, and Musical Entertainments.

'By providing places and means of recreation suitable to the seasons of the year.

'By providing refreshment-rooms for working-men, with a view to encourage temperate habits.

'II. The Union may lend its aid in forming separate associations, either general or local, &c.

'III. The Union shall consist of Members and Associates.'

The Bishop for the time being is always to be solicited to take office as Patron; the President is invariably to be a clergyman in priest's orders; the Council are composed of clergy and lay communicants in equal numbers. A Sermon, preached before the Union by the Rev. E. Palin, is appended to the Report. We trust that this item in the old English societies is to be maintained. The sermon itself is glowing and earnest, and speaks strongly upon duties of the laity in the general work of the Church.

From the printed outline of this society we look for much good service. We trust its good example may stimulate the combining tendency elsewhere, and that it may help to perpetuate the almost unique character which Oxford bears as to its parish system. We must repeat, however, what we have said as to the want of the higher and contemplative element. One noble object, indeed, of religious union is the help and influence which may be extended to those without. But are we not warranted in expecting, also, that some methods should be laid down for fostering that loftier form of individual piety towards which, in former times, association has proved so powerful an aid?

It is time now to give a few words to those English brotherhoods which, founded for the purposes of Christian communion and charitable labours, have probably influenced the rise of those of which we have spoken. Awakened by a deep sense of that 'holiness without which no man shall see the Lord,' and provoked by the frequent sights of profanity, debauchery, and suicide around them, a few young men were gradually drawn together by the preaching of Dr. Horneck and Mr. Smithies. Bishop Kidder, in his life of the former, does not attribute to him the design of founding any special society, though he says of his personal piety, 'he was a man who might have passed for a saint even in the best and purest times of Christianity.' He appears to have been the director of several, until an early and saintlike departure closed a life of anxious and intense application to the wants of multitudes.

The rare little book of Josiah Woodward's, '*Rise and Progress of the Religious Societies in the City of London*,' asserts that

no names of Stewards can be found previously to the year 1678; and this, also, fails to attribute any origin to them beyond what is commonly called accidental. However, the men whose character from the first conferred the task of guidance and organization, quickly turned to good account the growing tendency to combined effort. Many of these associations were founded in London, and in 1712 no less than ten existed in Dublin, under the patronage of Archbishop King. They were also attempted in the country, and so powerfully were thoughtful minds affected by the movement, that 'a very pious and learned foreigner,' for they had been established on the Continent also, writes in the following words in the year 1700 :—

'For my own part, I look upon these things as comfortable signs that the Spirit of God is now about a great work, to put a new face on the whole Christian Church.'—*Josiah Woodward's account.*

In these societies a meeting took place every week; stated subjects connected with Christian life were appointed for conference; their avowed object being to apply themselves to good discourse and things whereby they might edify one another. At these meetings all were permitted to speak, within certain limitations, and 'they were accustomed to communicate their experience one to another.' These meetings were connected with the vigils and festivals of the Church, and were carried out further by frequent attendance at Holy Communion, and at the weekly sermons, preached by some chosen director. We will transcribe for illustration their first twelve subjects of conference:—

1. Self-examination.
2. Self-abasement.
3. Faith in our Lord Jesus Christ.
4. Repentance.
5. Effectual conversion.
6. Trust in God.
7. Humility.
8. Mortification.
9. Christian hope.
10. Christian charity.
11. Alms deeds.
12. Contentment.

Twelve occasions were observed in the year for conference on the Holy Eucharist. Specific forms of prayer were in use in these brotherhoods, which were conducted by some clergyman, and the spirit of devotion aimed at in their meetings was preserved also in their ordinary life; see, for instance, the

following points of obligation taken from the society at the Savoy :—

‘To love one another. When reviled, not to revile again.
‘To speak evil of no man. To pray if possible seven times a
‘day. To keep close to the Church of England. To transact
‘all things peaceably and gently. To be helpful to each other.
‘To use themselves to holy thoughts in their going in and coming
‘out. To examine themselves every night. To give every one
‘their due. To obey superiors, both spiritual and temporal.’

All were accustomed to pray daily for the society. Admission of members was by election, each supplying a written declaration of their motives on seeking admission.

The good service, however, which these brotherhoods effected for the Church, was shortened by a gradual change of object. They were soon connected with the Society for the Reformation of Manners, and the pursuit of individual piety appears to have given place to a warfare upon the sins and vices of the world.

Josiah Woodward gives a catalogue of the arrests and punishments in which they had been instrumental; among their objects, he states, ‘The maintenance of the authority of the laws of God in this land.’ Frequent and earnest appeals are made to the secular magistrate, and we are reminded of the rigid connexion between the prison and the pulpit attempted shortly before by the Puritans. From the almost unparalleled list of crimes upon which Dr. Woodward dwells, we doubt not the temptation to this change was strong; but the salt which had seasoned their early piety must have ‘lost its savour.’ Perhaps they knew not themselves that the ‘weapons of their warfare’ were becoming ‘carnal.’

On comparing the constitution of these societies with those which now claim some distant connexion with them, we are instantly struck by the large security provided for inward and progressive piety. They were busied also in the founding of schools, they distributed alms and taught the ignorant; but the weekly conference was likewise an essential. It is precisely this inward element which we believe in our present fraternities is too feeble.

Let us now approach this subject from a different point of view. If there is one thing which thinking persons believe has been defective in the Church of England, it is that of social influence; the author of ‘Ploughing and Sowing’ represents that in Yorkshire the popular view of undertaking a religious life necessitates the joining some particular Dissenting society. The perversion could not well be greater, as being really the desertion of the Church in which generally the person has been baptized, and therefore might have been reared up to join some system

which is antagonistic to it. But does this notion prevail only in the North of England? In our usual parochial management, is there any union realized between ourselves and our fellow-worshippers, beyond that of taking the same pathway to the same house of God? Arrived there, the gradations of pews and the imperfect accommodation for the poor instantly suggest that the parish is not a community with respect to worship. We are very familiar with the sentiment, now become a widespread item of belief in this country, that occasional sympathy and union with dissent is no violation of Christian unity. The Church has no practical expression of membership, therefore no charge of schism can easily be borne out. But it will be replied, that in a national form of religion there must be a large margin comprehending the insincere and the undetermined. Let us look then among those who are admitted to our highest privileges, and ask what methods exist by which even communicants may be taught that they are one body in the Lord. Is there really much greater sense of union or mutual interest to be found amongst them? How much of bearing one another's burdens, of exhorting and admonishing one another, of seeking those things by which one may edify another, of being perfectly united in the same mind and in the same judgment? Next to the overpowering fact of the incarnation, Primitive Christianity knew no stronger attractive force than union of its members. 'By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye love one another.' Shall we look to testimonies of the subsequent age? let us weigh such a passage as this from S. Clement.

'Night and day there was a contest among you on behalf of the whole brotherhood, that the whole number of its elect should be saved in mercy and unity; ye were sincere and without memory of injuries towards each other, and schism was hateful to you. Ye grieved over the offences of those around you, and their shortcomings ye regarded as your own; ye were constant in well doing, and ready for every good work. Perfected in all virtuous and godly conversation, ye accomplished all things in the fear of the Lord. His commandments were written upon the breadth of your hearts.'

The same outline of intercession for all Christian orders, the like remembrance of the poor, the same formal expression of sacred unity in the celebration of the Holy Eucharist, remain with us, as may be found in the accounts of Justin Martyr, or in the Primitive Liturgies. Yet who that has read either can resist the melancholy impression of how little is left of the original spirit? Indeed, judging of the common standard of piety as nurtured by our parochial system, one shrinks from the comparison, whether with the Epistles of S. Paul or the writings of those who followed him. The entire subject, there-

fore, resolves itself into two questions. First, are we to see a revival of an order which is asserted to have had a distinct place in the constitution of the primitive Church, that of Deaconess? Next, can we so improve the social working of the Church, so enlarge the sphere of sympathy, and deepen the channels of its communion and fellowship, 'that every member of the same may realize his vocation and ministry?' The excellent pamphlet of Mr. Hayne, who has himself opened a Training Institution for Deaconesses, shows, by detailed argument from the Epistles, that the office is as old as Apostolic times. The recent article in the *Quarterly*, to which the Bishop of Salisbury has invited the attention of his clergy, has done the same; and we suppose that few who have any acquaintance with the accredited Commentaries on the Epistles have any doubt of the fact. It is clear, then, that as a Church we have run the risk of laying aside one definite item of primitive constitution in hitherto withholding from female helpers their due sanction and appointment. Three times in the last few years has the subject received the favourable notice of Convocation; we trust that it will not be long ere those to whom it is one of deep and earnest feeling, may be supported by the encouragement they have a right to expect from a Church whose basis is primitive authority.

We must be excused a digression here while we advert to the kindred fact so freely conceded as to be nearly ignored, namely, that the Church of England has practically lost the office of Deacon also. We need not delay to ask what similarity there can be found between this initiatory step towards the full clerical office, which almost invariably follows within two years at the furthest, and the original institution. The real functions of the Diaconate seem in great part assumed by the Scripture Reader. We have no great sympathy with 'The Church of England Scripture Readers' Association,' but we cannot help quoting the following passage, suggesting, as it does, much of the primitive notion of a Deacon carrying the Word of Life in all directions, as Philip at Samaria, or on the road to Gaza.

'During a period of fourteen years' visitation by a single Reader, 23,986 visits have been made to the poor of every class and character; 3,408 infants and 102 adults have been baptized on his recommendation; 2,016 children, and 158 male and 237 female adults, have been induced to attend the schools of the parish; 307 persons have been led to attend church who never attended before; 429 persons have been confirmed, and 269 have become Communicants during visitation by the Reader; 48 persons have been induced to marry, who before lived in open sin, and 334 persons have been visited during illness that terminated in death.'

Might not the Church improve the title of 'Church of England Association' by conferring some form of minor ordination on

those who do such work as this? We believe that in the Diocese of Exeter, Deacons' orders have been given with a view of their being perpetual, and not a necessary step to the priesthood. Supposing, however, that our Scripture Readers were raised to the regular office and title of Deacon, and the scanty band of Sisters of Charity were invested with the Church's blessing and authority, and both orders multiplied a hundred-fold, there would in our opinion remain a defect unrelieved—a defect relating, as we have pointed out, to the congregation itself. Incalculable as would be the service of a permanent Diaconate of both sexes, there must be the idea of 'a royal priesthood, a chosen generation,' more widely spread through the whole body, at least of Communicants. Without this the ceaseless yearning towards union and mutual support must still be unsatisfied, and the Christian profession within our Church remain to a great degree cold and inoperative.

In our view, then, the question now at issue is not merely the loss or the revival of offices originally apostolical, such as that of Deacon and Diaconess—and this has been well put by Mr. Hayne—but one of far deeper and wider interest: whether the loftier capacities of personal piety and of Christian labour shall find their home of shelter and their place of operation within the Church of England.

It may here be answered that the constitution of our Church being the opposite of democratic, any extensive sympathy among its members is of necessity repressed, and, indeed, could not be attained without the sacrifice of order and subordination. That we owe much to the complete independence of the clergy we doubt not. In the improvement of our ritual, and other such changes, which have never at first been popular, the fact seems not less than providential. But we cannot think that perfectly autocratic relation of the clergy towards the people, which the law concedes, and which is furthered by our high social position, will really stand the test of apostolic precedent. We have seen how greatly it has been modified in the American Church and in the Colonies; in both instances the attachment of the laity being secured by their larger share in the regulation of the Church, and proportionately increased intelligence of its principles. In our own system, the people's churchwarden is their sole necessary representative; it has been at the pleasure of the Incumbent himself to descend from his almost irresponsible position, and to invite freer means of intercourse. The fruits of this system have been such as would be naturally anticipated. From the vast extent of our dioceses, episcopal interference has never been what our theory supposes it should be. Hence the Parochial Clergy have had it in their power to do or leave

undone almost as much as they pleased. The legal requirements of Sunday work being fulfilled, the real ministry of souls, for life or death eternal, has been a matter of mere chance. Hence the total discrepancy between the internal condition of one parish and its neighbour; the fortunes of each being, in fact, left to rise or fall with the individual who for the time has charge. Whilst the Congregationalists and Wesleyans have awakened interest and vitality throughout their body, have had their class-leaders, their school-teachers, their deacons, their local preachers, and these unpaid, many of our largest parishes have been almost destitute of persons willing to take up the most obvious duties of charity.¹ Whilst they have developed an incessant energy and progress, by giving office to all who are willing to assist, the clergyman has numbered but his two or three stipendiaries, schoolmaster, clerk, and sexton. This want of participation in the actual work of the Church, we suppose, explains a common observation, that of all religious bodies Church people understand least of their own principles. Whilst the Dissenters as a body have shown their power in obtaining two weeks of special prayer connected with the revivals, for the last two years, in not half the parishes of England could there be found ten persons who ever make the slightest observance of the authorized Festivals and Fasts; while our standard calls to preparation and repentance at Advent and Lent are, as yet, but a mere shadow through the land. One diocese alone is a grand exception. Salisbury, we believe, is following.

We are not here speaking in despondency, nor, as we trust, in disrespect; but we must draw attention to certain glaring deficiencies, which we maintain should be honestly met and patiently considered. Nor are we forgetting the noble exceptions which have been witnessed, and in all of which, as at Leeds and Yarmouth, the principle of lay combination has been much aimed at. We are speaking of things only as they must appear in the eyes of disinterested observers; and we believe that the review of the last century and a half of our Church presents the mind with a system which has attracted too little of love, and set up but a feeble standard of devotion.

As a reaction, the Puritans established private meetings with free conference upon Holy Scripture. Soon after, the Independents assumed the right of extempore prayer, on the delusion of the gifts of prophecy being restored to the

¹ A case is before the writer's mind of one of the largest and wealthiest churches in London, where the clergy themselves were accustomed to spend entire days in distributing and registering tickets of charity. He was told that one lay-helper was all that could be found.

congregation at large. We know the history of their suppression: the deep mind of Laud foresaw that connexion, with which we are now familiar, between the theory of an indiscriminate priesthood and outright infidelity. The Church, arrayed in the learning of ages, maintained her own lofty reserve. She demanded obedience to her canons as echoing the voice of catholic authority; firm was her faith in her own right and mission—a faith which has bequeathed to us a Liturgy sound in essentials, and with it the solemn guardianship of mysteries still unrecognised by the natural man. Strong and noble was her confession when the storm of rebellion quickly undermined all that had been erected for mankind to respect, whether of human law or Divine Revelation. But, at the same time, with the entire extinction of Puritanism, the Church was the loser of one element of life and strength. The interest and personal responsibility of her lay members was greatly impaired. Their ideas of discipline, and the common attempt to make their visible Church co-extensive only with the holy and converted, were as impracticable as those of the Novatians. We remember how Baxter invited his parish at Kidderminster to join in his Church discipline, and give in their names. Out of 1,600 of an age to be communicants, only 600 united with him. But the other point for which they contended, the more extended interest of their lay members, is not thus easily answered. The taunt of Owen, in his ‘Nature of a Gospel Church,’ is, that the Church of England only admits of spiritual gifts as connected with office, ‘and supposes that all distinct ‘offices may be done well enough by one or two in the same ‘office.’ Whatever may be the interpretation of their favourite passages, such as Rom. xii. 5—8, Ephes. iv. 11 (and we agree with Thorndike that Lay eldership is completely mythical), and however this mention of varied functions may have reference to the pristine form of the Church, the general impression is irresistible, that something more is needed for the original idea of a Church society than priest and congregation, or preacher and audience. We believe that it has been from the increasing sense of this truth, that the piety of the present age is striving to fix itself on some fresh forms of social union and effort.

It is now our duty to show under what restriction, and with what encouragements, we believe lay agency might be adopted. We have already stated our opinion, that such unions should be attempted as parish institutions, believing that, on a large or small scale, they might be available with good effect everywhere. We would adopt, therefore, as our maxim the rule already quoted from the Lincoln Association, that our society ‘does

'not seek to form any new association apart from that congregation of faithful men, of which the Church consists.' It is to work in harmony with the Church, with the sole endeavour of giving point to its rules, spreading intelligence of its principles, and extending its sphere of holy influence.

There appear to be three aims which chiefly suggest themselves in the association which we are supposing. 1st.—Devotion. 2d.—Discipline. 3d.—Charitable labour. And we should judge, that in the formation of a religious society, these objects would be attained in the order we have laid down. It would not be difficult to find some persons in every parish whose anxiety for their own spiritual state would lead them to embrace some specific scheme of preparation for Holy Communion. It would naturally consist of the reading of Holy Scripture in common, conference upon it, and subsequent prayer. The second point then would quickly present itself; the private regulation of their own lives, and strict obedience to such rules as the Church has laid down for their direction. To engraft the third object would then be a matter of small difficulty; for, 'from the abundance of the heart' good feeling and the desire to help in the salvation of others would easily spring forth. Let us attempt an outline of rules upon each of these heads. 1st.—Let a meeting of all members take place each month, men and women separately, all being of course supposed to be communicants. 2d.—Let a subject of conference be appointed always beforehand. 3d.—Let one of the parochial clergy preside. 4th.—Let the president refer to appropriate passages of Scripture connected with the given subject, and let any be invited to add illustrations, or to ask questions. 5th.—Let an appointed office of prayer be compiled with special reference to the aims of the society, holiness of life, devout communion, and works of charity. 6th.—Let every member be bound to pray three times a day, always making some distinct intercession for the welfare of the brotherhood. 7th.—Let every member be encouraged to bring before the meeting any points of difficulty connected with Christian life.

Under the second head would come,—

1.—Strict observation of the Lord's Day, with due attendance at church. Each being accountable to the society for any failure in these points.

2.—The devout observance of Advent and Lent, with the positive engagement to make these seasons the opportunities of special prayer, both privately and publicly, with due attendance upon week-day sermons.

3.—The observance of the festivals and fasts of the Church, implying at least attendance at evening service, when there

should always be a sermon especially framed for the day. This rule shall also include all Fridays as days of abstinence, or at least of particular penitential prayer.

4.—Holy Communion should be received once every month at the least, and this never without special preparation.

5.—Every one should seek perfect reconciliation with their neighbours beforehand, and should do their utmost to spread a spirit of peace and forgiveness amongst all. •

Every member should on entrance be enrolled, having been previously elected on his own promise of obedience to and co-operation with the association. A certificate, with date of election, and with the specified work of each, should be supplied.

Under the last head of charitable labour would come all such offices as we have alluded to in reference to the Guild of S. Alban, teaching at schools, singing in choirs, relief of the sick, &c.

In every case the active members should definitely undertake some one responsible work, and should give account of this at some stated periodical meeting of the society. The other members should as distinctly pledge themselves to everything contained under devotion and discipline.

A few duties perhaps might be added to the list of the Guild, such as receiving Holy Communion with the sick, and assistance in the conduct of missionary services; possibly some such services, held merely in houses, might be conducted by an authorized lay member alone, with the caution that anything in the way of a sermon should be not original, but invariably read from a book. We believe that the clergy might be greatly aided in the outlying parts of country parishes by such duties taken up by pious laymen, reserving at the same time their own proper position.¹ A parallel list of duties might be drawn out for the female helpers, including all that is at present attempted by our district visitors. But we do not suppose that all would be active members. The observances connected with the first two heads, Devotion and Discipline, might be profitably entered upon by many, who from various causes could not render active assistance. In such cases their prayers, alms, and counsel, would be a sufficient contribution to the work of the society.

We should lay it down as a standard regulation, that a meeting of the whole body should take place each quarter, at which the progress of its various works, its expenditure, its prospects, and its difficulties, should be gathered up and read; and this,

¹ The various Dissenting bodies have established a complete network of such devotional gatherings in all the neglected corners of our parishes; they are mainly conducted by their laity. Our 'Cottage Lecture' is generally regarded as a piece of extraordinary devotion on the part of the clergy.

of course, would imply the offices of steward and treasurer, as well as president. The entire body would form a council, and every member should be bound to communicate to the society, through the president, any subject which he thinks would tend to the well-being of the Church. We should suppose, also, that about the time of the general meetings a solemn occasion of public worship in the Church should be appointed, and that some accredited preacher should be invited by the president to address the society upon such subjects as the blessedness of Christian union, or the higher requisitions of the spiritual life. On these occasions there should be a combination with any other similar societies. If held at any hour after the usual time of work, both men and women of all grades might easily attend; or it would be sufficient if these larger meetings took place once or twice in the year. Lastly, we suppose that the sanction of the Diocesan should in all cases be sought to the rules and the operations of the society, and that, if possible, he should, by some formal act of authority, give his blessing to the work.

Let us now briefly inquire what advantages might be derived from the scheme we have described. That the particular works of charity are to some degree already taken up, and executed with zeal and self-denial, we are ready to admit. But almost invariably there is a lack of workers, and what is done is scarcely ever done by *men*; usually it is by young ladies—the most impressible and willing, but the least reliable agents. Add to this, that there is very little feeling of responsibility attaching to the so-called task of District Visiting; no kind of instruction; not a shadow of probation. Any spare hand among a series of unmarried daughters is supposed efficient. Hence, from the unfitness of the present agents, it is generally found impossible to carry out anything of the sort where it is most needed, that is, in large and degraded populations. We repeat, it is *men* that are wanted. In the Society of S. Vincent de Paul there are male associates drawn from the trade, the merchant, and the independent class. If they can be found in considerable numbers to work in connexion with the parochial clergy, and give so many hours a week of charitable labour, why should not the religion of this country command equal respect, and the Church of England open a way for the same willing service? May it not be, that we have been hiring Scripture Readers, when we had them in our own parishes, if we had only sought them?

Next, let us consider the immense impetus which would be given to this lay agency, if raised into a diocesan institution. One parish would speedily follow another—where once established it could scarcely die out, and the spiritual well-being of the

community, with its works of charity, could scarcely be, as now, dependent on the single character of the clergyman. We add, too, the encouragement which many a timid heart would receive, and the strengthening of many a feeble hand by the feeling of sympathy and the participation of intercessory prayer. Imagine, too, the altered phase of many a family, high and low, from having one of its members connected with the association. That one might be the link between both piety and charity, and ten or twenty who had been strangers to both. Another general effect, which, with the Divine blessing, we might predict is, the positive advance in devotional life through the Church at large. One fundamental defect in our present labours of charity is, that they are so indirectly connected with our own spiritual progress. Work and prayer have not been sufficiently united. The one should react upon the other, interchanging loftiness of motive with reality of action. Another result we might look for is the improvement of our worship. At present very rarely is any account made in the execution of our ritual of any but those of the lowest religious capacity. Hence is the Liturgy read very much as a lecture to those who are not supposed to have entered at all into the heights of its meaning. Sermons are generally, and perhaps rightly, aimed towards conversion, because they are delivered to the masses. We hardly know of an instance where the early celebration of Holy Communion ever is made the occasion of any more fervent kind of address. Do those who are thus satisfied see that they are really reducing the entire body of the faithful to the mere level of Catechumens? Hence one uniform low standard has prevailed, and the Holy Eucharist, as the line of distinction marking off the full Christian profession, has been ignored. Might not the societies we have attempted to delineate both furnish the methods of a more vigorous Christian profession, and the means of that loftier religious literature which hitherto we have found only in the Continental Church or in the mediæval cloister?

In speaking thus of associations in parishes, we by no means desire to undervalue the intention of those who have attempted to revive the female diaconate in our recent sisterhoods.

But we believe that the former are almost equally important. There always has been a large amount of Christian zeal and energy outside the clerical order. It was so in apostolic times, and it found its satisfaction in the more intense appreciation of those duties and relations which are really incumbent on us all. It was so in the Church of the middle ages. The Franciscans in their origin were but a community of lay Christians, who studied apostolic simplicity and self-abnegation; the Waldenses

were the same, though the one order was adopted by the Western Church, and the other failed to make its terms; multitudes of associations might be quoted to the same purpose. And there exists about the Church of England a broad margin of spiritual life and activity; but unfortunately, not only without the ranks of the clergy, but outside even its lay communion. It has issued in forms often of wild and startling enthusiasm. A late lay preacher - at Exeter Hall (an ex-prizefighter) announced that the Gospel would soon find its way into every corner of London, not by an exclusive order vested in 'night-shirts,' but by the voice of every man who felt its truth. In the Irish revivals has been proclaimed the monstrous delusion of a fresh Pentecost, together with such theories of private illumination and assurance as, if true, would render all claims of the Church and its sacraments either superfluous or an imposture.

But this cannot be said of the Wesleyans or of the many settled forms of dissent around us. They have indeed commonly proceeded to the utter denial of any existing sacred Church system upon earth, thus opening the way to total scepticism as to the means of grace or standard of truth. This, however, was very often not the tenet with which they commenced their course. Vast numbers have been drawn in by the simple attraction of social sympathy, the greater opportunities of charitable work, and sometimes by the facility of obtaining ministerial office. Fearful as is the spectacle of modern dissent, we cannot regard it as a mere congeries of mischievous heresy, which the Church is well rid of; we believe religious association in the Church itself presents the only chance of arresting it.

ART. X.—1. *Lectures on the History of the Eastern Church, with an Introduction on the Study of Ecclesiastical History.* By ARTHUR PENRHYN STANLEY, D.D. Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Oxford, and Canon of Christ Church. London: Murray.

2. *Acta Patriarchatus Constantinopolitani, MCCCXV—MCCCCH. e Codd. MSS. sumptus præbente Cæsareâ scientiarum Academiâ, ediderunt FR. MIKLOSICH, Prof. Univers. Vindobon. et Jos. Müller, Prof. Universit. Patavinæ. Tomus prior. Vindobonæ: Carolus Gerold. 1860.*
3. *Σύνταγμα τῶν Θείων καὶ ἱερῶν κανονῶν τῶν τε ἁγίων καὶ πανευφήμεων ἀποστόλων, καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν οἰκουμενικῶν καὶ τοπικῶν συνόδων, καὶ τῶν κατὰ μέρος ἁγίων πατέρων, ἐκδοθεν, σὺν πλείστοις ἄλλαις τὴν ἐκκλησιαστικὴν κατάστασιν διευποῦσαι διατάξεσι, μετὰ τῶν ἀρχαίων ἐξηγητῶν, καὶ διαφόρων ἀναγνωσμάτων, ὑπὸ Γ. Α. ΠΑΛΛΗ καὶ Μ. ΠΟΤΛΗ, ἐγκρίσει τῆς Ἀγίας καὶ Μεγάλης τοῦ Χριστοῦ Ἐκκλησίας. Ἀθηνῆσιν, ἐκ τῆς τυπογραφίας Γ. Χαρτοφύλακος, 1852.*
4. *Le Raskol: Essai historique et critique sur les Sectes religieuses en Russie.* Paris: A. Franck. 1859.
5. *Histoire, Dogmes, Traditions, et Liturgie de l'Eglise Armenienne Orientale.* Par E. DULAURIER. Paris: A. Franck. 1859.

NOTHING can show the increased and increasing interest which attaches itself to the Eastern Church, more than the fact that the Professor of Ecclesiastical History at Oxford should have chosen it for the subject of his first series of lectures. And the argument is the stronger, because Dr. Stanley would never,—and, in several passages of the work we are to consider, he confesses as much,—have chosen that subject of his own accord. He seems almost to apologise for such a selection; and promises his auditors that, if they will listen patiently to him now, he hopes to take them hereafter into more stirring scenes, and epochs of more vital importance to ourselves. Whatever we may think of the necessity for such an apology, we at all events earnestly hope that he may long be spared to fulfil his promise.

It would be in the highest degree disrespectful to Professor Stanley himself, and indeed to the University in which his lectures have been delivered, to give merely a cursory glance at his work. The only question is, in what way we may most thoroughly take it into consideration. And after some thought, we believe that we can pursue no better plan than this: to go through it, chapter by chapter in order, directing the attention

of our readers to the many eloquent passages which occur in it, while at the same time we shall not shrink from pointing out some errors in fact, and some assertions which an Eastern Christian (to say nothing of ourselves) would consider errors in opinion.

In the first place we are disposed to find fault with the very title of the work. These lectures on the Eastern Church consist of three parts, in addition to a very able introduction. The first contains a history of the Council of Nicæa, of which it is scarcely possible, as a work of art, to speak too highly: the next a brief sketch of the rise of Mahometanism, on which we shall have to pass a very different verdict: and the third a dissertation on the Russian Church, which, if not equal to the first part of the work, contains much which will be new to English students of Church history.

We will commence then with the Introduction: and we can give no better idea of the whole tone of the work than by the following quotation which occurs at the very commencement:—

‘I have said that the field of Eastern Christendom is a comparatively untrodden field. It is out of sight, therefore out of mind. But there is a wise German proverb which tells us that it is good from time to time to be reminded that, ‘Hinter dem Berge sind auch Leute.’ This, true of all large bodies of the human family, from whom we are separated by natural or intellectual divisions, is eminently true of the whole branch of the Christian faith that lies in the far East. Behind the mountains of our knowledge, of our civilization, of our activity—behind the mountains, let us also say, of our ignorance, of our prejudice, of our contempt—is to be found nearly a third part of Christendom: one hundred millions of souls professing the Eastern faith. No theory of the Christian Church can be complete, which does not take some account of their existence. The proper distances, the lights and shades, of the foreground which we ourselves occupy, of the prospect which we ourselves overlook, cannot be rightly represented without bearing in mind the enormous, dark, perhaps unintelligible masses, which form the background that closes the retrospect of our view.’

And then follows this noble passage:—

‘It is a Church, in fact, not of cities and villages, but of mountains and rivers, and caves and dens of the earth. The eye passes from height to height, and rests on the successive sanctuaries in which the religion of the East has entrenched itself as within natural fortresses against its oppressors; Athos in Turkey, Sinai in Arabia, Ararat in Armenia, the cedars of Lebanon, the catacombs of Kieff, the cavern of Megaspelon, the cliffs of Meteora. Or we see it advancing up and down the streams, or clinging to the banks of the mighty rivers which form the highways and arteries of the wide plains of the East. The Nile still holds its sacred place in the liturgies of Egypt. The Jordan, from Constantine downwards, has been the goal of every Eastern pilgrim. Up the broad stream of the Dnieper sail the first apostles of Russia. Along the Volga and the Don cluster the mysterious settlements of Russian non-conformity.’

Nothing can be truer or more beautiful than this. But now let us ask how it comes to pass that so many historical events,

NO. CXIII.—N.S. Q

at least as nearly connected with the Eastern Church as was the Council of Nicæa, find no place here? Why not, more especially, the Council of Chalcedon, which, in the very teeth of Rome, elevated Constantinople to the second rank? Why not the Fifth Council, so famous from its anathema pronounced on a Roman Pontiff? Why not the *Quinisext*, the very source of Ecclesiastical law in the East from that time to this? Above all, why not the Council of Florence, the history of which (about to be translated from the Russ) will be no small addition to English Ecclesiastical lore? Again; in a series of Essays on the Eastern Church,—embracing, as our author does, heretical as well as orthodox communions under that title,—some space ought surely to be allotted to that marvellous Nestorian Church, which in the eleventh century out-numbered Eastern and Western Churches taken together. Surely something also of the Paulicians, the only existing immoral heresy of the East. Surely, too, of the controversies connected with Cyril Lucar, and the Councils of Constantinople and Jassy, and above all, of Bethlehem: and also that of Constantinople in 1691, which we believe has never been noticed in any English Ecclesiastical history.

These Councils are undoubtedly events of the highest interest in the Eastern Church; and no doubt in any series of essays on that subject which profess to be complete, they ought to have found a place. At the same time, as Dr. Johnson once said, ‘an author is not bound to tell us more than he will:’ and, therefore, we ought to be thankful for that which Professor Stanley has told us. Let us look a little more closely into his first lecture.

I. We must, in the first place, enter our most strenuous protest against one of its earliest sentences: ‘The Greek dialect of the East, after the sixth century, becomes almost intolerable to the eye and the ear of the classical student.’ We suppose that the author would tell us; in the first place, how worthless is the general style of composition employed by the Greek Church: in the next, how barbarous are its measures.

To commence with the last charge. It was a sad loss for us English scholars when the accentual pronunciation of Greek was surrendered for a fancied prosodiacal theory. Up to the Revolution of 1688, the older system, that taught in Europe by the refugees from the fall of Constantinople, undoubtedly prevailed. It has left traces in our language even to this day. *María* we might indeed have obtained through the Latin: but why *Sophía* instead of *Sophía*? Why *S. Hēlēna* (the island) instead of *S. Hēlēna*? And so it may be observed in all mediæval Latin poetry, we find such an accentuation as,—*Luciā*,

harmonia, melodia, theoria, theologia and the like. Take again Milton. How often has that line been pronounced utterly inharmonious :

‘ And Tiresias and Phineus, prophets old.’

Undoubtedly had the poet’s pronunciation been that which ours is, he would have written :

‘ And Phineus and Tirēsius, prophets old.’

But he pronounced Tiresias with the accent on the penultimate ; that is, if a merely English reader would understand us, he would have had his line read thus :—

‘ And Tireseias and Phineus, prophets old.’

Making a synalœpha between the syllables *ei* and *as*. In fact, the barbarism of Greek pronunciation is certainly on our side. Read a passage from Demosthenes, according to the strictest rules of our universities, to an Athenian scholar, and it will be an excess of courtesy only, which can prevent his smiling at your ludicrous mispronunciation.

Now we must make one allowance, at the commencement. We cannot affirm of the Greek, as we may, with great probability, of the Latin, that the regeneration of the language, under the influence of the Church, was but a return to the general type of its earliest poetry. When we read such a hymn as the—

‘ Pange lingua gloriosi proelium certaminis ;’

we are reading a rhythm not unlike that which the

—rusticorum mascula militum
Proles, Sabellis docta ligonibus
Versare glebas, et severæ
Matris ad arbitrium recisos
Portare fustes—’

would at once have recognised as their own. But we cannot say, that S. Cosmas of Maiuma, or S. John Damascene, in like manner returned to the metres of Thespis or his contemporaries. Still, Professor Stanley would, we are sure, have taste and courage enough (and we will rather accuse his deficiency of reading on an out-of-the-way subject, than imagine any want of true criticism on the part of so very elegant a writer) to admire the Eastern Church, for throwing herself boldly into a new theory of rhythm. The new wine could not be poured into the old vessels. What! stanzas of this kind intolerable to the classical student? We will boldly match them against any strophe of,—what they should really be compared with,—Pindar, both for the poetry and for the metre; provided it be granted, that S. John Damascene had as good a right to prefer accent to quantity, as Pindar had to subordinate the former to the latter.

αὕτη ἡ κλητὴ καὶ ἁγία ἡμέρα,
ἡ μία τῶν Σαββάτων,
ἡ βασιλὶς καὶ κυρία,
ἐορτῶν ἐορτῇ,
καὶ πανηγυρὶς ἐστὶ πανηγύρεω·
ἐν ἣ εὐλογοῦμεν Χριστὸν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.

Δεῦτε τοῦ καινοῦ τῆς ἀμπέλου γεννήματος,
τῆς θείας εὐφροσύνης,
ἐν τῇ εὐσήμεν ἡμέρᾳ
τῆς ἐγέρσεως,
βασιλείας τοῦ Χριστοῦ, κοινωνήσωμεν,
ὑμνοῦντες αὐτὸν, ὡς Θεὸν, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.

* Ἄρον κύκλω τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς σου, Σιών, καὶ ἴδε·
ἰδοὺ γὰρ ἤκασί σοι
θεοφεγγεῖς ὡς φωστῆρες,
ἐκ δυσμῶν, καὶ βορρᾶ,
καὶ θαλάσσης, καὶ ἐώας τὰ τέκνα σου,
ἐν σοὶ εὐλογοῦντα Χριστὸν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.

Now, do not let it be said that we are not staunch admirers of the old heathen lyrical bard, and we give him the full glory of which some modern critics seem disposed to deprive him. But now let us compare what, to our mind, is the finest passage of the classic, with a parallel place (by no means the finest we could select) from the Christian poet.

ἴσον δε νύκτεσσιν αἰεῖ,
ἴσα δ' ἐν ἀμέραις ἄλιον ἔχοντες ἀπονέστερον
ἐσλοὶ δεδόρκαντι βίον, οὐ χθόνα ταρασσόντες ἐν χερσὶ ἀκμῇ
οὐδὲ πόντιον ὕδωρ
κεινὰν παρὰ δαίταν· ἀλλὰ παρὰ μὲν τιμίοις
θεῶν, οὔτινες ἔχαιρον εὐορκίαις, ἀδακρὺν νέμονται
αἰῶνα· τοὶ δ' ἀπροσδόρατον ὀκχέοντι πόνον·

ὅσοι δ' ἐτόλμασαν ἐστρὶς
ἐκατέρωθι μέιναντες ἀπὸ πάμπαν ἀδίκων ἔχειν
ψυχὰν, ἔπειλαν Διὸς ὁδὸν παρὰ Κρόνου τύρσιν· ἔνθα μακάρων
νᾶσον ὠκεανίδες
αὖραι περιπνέουσιν, ἄνθεμα δὲ χρυσοῦ φλέγει,
τὰ μὲν χερσὶθεν ἀπ' ἀγλαῶν δενδρέων, ὕδωρ δ' ἄλλα φέρβει,
ὄρμοις τῶν χέρας ἀναπλέκοντι καὶ κεφαλὰς.—κ.τ.λ.

They are glorious stanzas, we most willingly allow; yet perhaps scarcely so glorious as the following¹ fragment, especially if we regard it as sung in the calm brilliancy of a Mediterranean sunset.²

¹ It is marked (1) in the fragments of the *Θρηνοί*.

² See Disson's Note on the Isthmia, iii. §1. 'Quod autem occidente sole hæ inferioræ cœptæ fieri, illustratur loco a Müllero notato: Schol. Apollon. Rhod. i. 587. Τοῖς μὲν οὖν κατοιχομένοις ὡς περὶ ἡλίου δυσμὰς ἐναγίζουσι, τοῖς δὲ Οὐρανίδασι ὑπὸ τῇ Ἑω, ἀνατέλλοντος τοῦ ἡλίου. Idem dicit Scholastes ad hunc Pindari locum: Ἐθὺς πρὸς δυσμὰς ἱεουργεῖν τοῖς ἥρωσι, κατὰ τὰς ἀνατολὰς τοῖς θεοῖς.'

τοῖσι λάμπει μὲν μένος ἀελίου τὰν ἐνθάδε νύκτα κάτω
 φοινικορόδοις τ' ἐνὶ λειμώνεσσι προάστιον αὐτῶν
 καὶ λιβάνῳ σκιάρα καὶ χρυσέοις καρποῖς βέβριθεν
 καὶ τοὶ μὲν ἵπποις γυμνασίοις τε, τοὶ δὲ πεσσοῖς,
 τοὶ δὲ φορμίγγεσσι τέρονται, παρὰ δὲ σφισιν εὐανθὴς ἅπας τέθαλεν ὄλβος·
 ὁδμὰ δ' ἐρατὸν κατὰ χώραν κίδναται
 αἰεὶ θύα μινύτων πυρὶ τηλεφανεῖ παντοῖα θεῶν ἐπὶ βωμοῖς.

Yet we will not fear to match with these, the following stanzas from All Saints Sunday; which we choose, however, not so much for their mere beauty, as from the identity of their subject.

Ἱερωσύνην ἱερὰν,
 Οἱ Ἱερεῖς καὶ Ποιμένες,
 ἐνδυσάμενοι, καὶ ταύτην ἐμφρόνως
 κυβερνήσαντες, Χριστὲ,
 ἀξίως κατεκόσμησαν διδασκαλίας λόγον,
 ἄνωθεν ὄντως πλουτήσαντες.

ὠριασθέντες καλλοναῖς
 τῆς πρώτης καλλοποιίας
 καὶ φανέντες, ἀπλανεῖς ὡς φωστῆρες,
 οὐρανῶσατε Χριστοῦ
 τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, Ἅγιοι, ἄλλοθεν ἄλλος, ταύτην
 ποικίλως κατακοσμήσαντες.

νόμῳ περιθόμενοι τῷ σῶ
 τῶν μακαρίων οἱ δῆμοι,
 πολυτρόποις ἀρεταῖς φαιδρυνθέντες,
 ἐκληρώσαντο μονὰς
 τὰς οὐρανίους, χαίροντες ἄλλην γὰρ ἄλλος
 ταύτας ἀξίως ἐπλήρωσαν.

τὴν οὐράνιον πύλιν καὶ κιβωτὸν,
 τὸ πανάγιον ὄρος, τὴν φωταυγὴ νεφέλην ὑμνήσωμεν.
 τὴν οὐράνιον κλίμακα, τὸν λογικὸν Παράδεισον,
 τῆς Εὐας τὴν λύτρωσιν,
 τῆς οἰκουμένης πάσης τὸ μέγα κειμήλιον
 ὅτι σωτηρία ἐν αὐτῇ διεπράχθη τῷ κόσμῳ,
 καὶ ἄφεσις τῶν ἀρχαίων ἐγκλημάτων.

Now if any one, admiring the stanzas of Pindar quoted above, can yet call these 'intolerable to the eye and the ear,' we cannot argue with him. There have been persons, we know, who, while lavishing a life in emending the inanities of Silius Italicus, or the bombast of Statius, could call the *Dies Ire* barbarous. So York Minster has been called 'a barbarous church, but large, of the Gothique sort.' We say it fearlessly,—there is as much art in the accentual disposition of the stanzas of S. Cosmas of Maiuma and S. John Damascene, as there is in the metrical arrangement of Pindar. But the former requires as much study as the latter; and till that study (and it is not a work of two or three months) is freely bestowed, the Christian Canons will be deemed barbarous by those who lavish their admiration on the Pagan Epinicia.

II. We proceed to another remark of our writer;—and here again we must enter our protest. ‘The system has produced no practical works of Christian benevolence.’

There is a city deafened by the roar of two thousand cannons and mortars, a fiery hail sweeping every street,—the blue sky blotted out by volumes of smoke,—deadly rockets, hissing forth destruction, in the air, shells ploughing up the thoroughfares or demolishing the houses. The assault is made by sea and by land: and surely if ever hell seemed let loose, it was so on that day, and round those devoted walls.

Nearly in the centre of this city is an hospital—a long, white, low erection. The besieged have planted a black flag over it, as if to implore, in the name of a common SAVIOUR, that the artillerymen will spare that building. And they do spare it, as far as they can. Nevertheless, its sides are riddled with cannon-balls, and every now and then a bursting shell spreads terror and dismay among its inmates.

In the large room are crowds of wounded, in every stage of mortal agony; the surgeons, worn out with toil, are amputating still, still operating, and every moment fresh cases, more terrible groans, more frightful lacerations. In this room there are, also, twelve Basilian Sisters; there they have been ministering for the last six and thirty hours—there they will remain till the final catastrophe. Every palliasse sends its own stream of blood to the red lake that covers the whole floor, now nearly ten inches deep—to be deeper still, ere the day’s work is over—and sends up its horrible, sickening odour. And when those Sisters shall have an hour’s leisure to return to their convent, their feet will be ingrained with blood¹ above the ankle-bone, and the exertion and the stench will have sown in every one of them the seeds of typhus, under which half will sink. Is not this ‘practical Christian benevolence’?

Again: look at the Lazar-villages in the Archipelago, where once to enter is to enter for life; and look at the Basilian nuns who immure themselves in those abodes of despair, knowing that, in all human probability, they must themselves fall victims to that living death. The fearful character of the disease itself, the awful misery of the closing scene, the singular way in which it affects mind as well as body, generally with the most miserable languor and depression, sometimes with even more fearful impulses, make this a work of the most sublime heroism—a heroism to which the Latin Church (and no fault of hers) has

¹ The writer was informed of this fact by an Eastern Priest, who had it from the Hegumene of the Convent in Sebastopol;—she herself having assisted in washing the feet of her Sisters on their return.

nothing to oppose. Again, is not this 'practical' Christian benevolence'?

Once more: we know from the accounts of travellers what is that most dreary, most fearful waste of Siberia, with its countless versts of monotonous sand, marked out by equally monotonous post-houses. Who is it that has planted civilization here and there over those vast steppes,—that has accommodated even the immutable Eastern Offices to the wandering habits of those nomad tribes,—that has Christianized, to an extent beyond that which is generally imagined, the steppes of Central Asia? Let the work of the late Alexander Stourdza, the Russian missionary-historian, answer the question.

And yet again: we know the efforts that Rome has made to get a footing in China; the labours of the Jesuits, the manner in which they endeavoured to soften the offence of the Cross, the very small result of their toil; and, in spite of their zeal and learning, their final repulse. And Russian missionaries, without this world's learning, setting forth the doctrine of the Cross in its austere form, have obtained a footing among that most extraordinary people, where Rome has utterly failed. Is not this a 'work of benevolence'?

III. The next point on which our author enters, is the territorial division of the Eastern Church. He divides it thus:—

- '1. The National, or so-called Heretical Church of each country.
- '2. The Orthodox branch of each Church in communion with the See of Constantinople.
- '3. The United or Catholic branch, consisting of converts to the Roman Catholic Church.'

Now, it is scarcely possible not to remark on the preconceived theory of which those words, 'the National, or so-called Heretical Church,' are only the expression. There are Churches, as we shall presently see, intensely national, which have never had stain of heresy; though we are quite willing to allow that it does so happen, that most of the Eastern National Churches are, at the present time, heretical. Let us go through Canon Stanley's list.

(a) The Chaldeans or Nestorians: once the most widely extended Church on earth; now, and especially since the fearful massacres from which of late years they have suffered, reduced to the inhabitants of one valley. It is well known that many modern writers have regarded the Nestorians as the remnant of the Ten Tribes, and they seem by no means ill-pleased to be so considered. It would have been well had our author given some idea of the present numbers of this once enormous Church. They may be stated, we believe, as follows (we partly depend on Mr. Badger's most excellent work,

which was published in 1852, and partly on later information, which we have ourselves received from local researches).¹

1. Mosul, the Patriarch See, 6,800 souls.
2. Bagdad, 380 souls.
3. Diarbekr, 720 souls.
4. Sert, 1,850 souls.
5. Mardeen, 380 souls.
6. Jezeerah, 1,120 souls.
7. Kerkook, 1,274 souls.
8. Khosrâwa, 900 souls.

To these we may add a few scattered families near the Great Zab, in the mountains of Buhtân, and in other detached and lonely villages. But the members of the Church which once outweighed East and West together, do not now, at the very outside, exceed 18,000.

(b) *The Armenians.* This, next to the Orthodox Church of the East, is by far the most powerful of all its communions. The seat of its Patriarchate, Etchmiadzin, under Ararat, is the most venerable of all the ecclesiastical buildings of Asia. The union of these so-called heretics with the Orthodox Church, has been attempted again and again, and will probably some day be carried out. We may fairly believe, that the heresy itself merely arose, in the first place, from the accidental absence of every Armenian Bishop from Chalcedon; and, in the next, from the poverty, in that respect, of the language, which had at that time but one term for Nature and Person; so that when the six hundred and thirty fathers declared that CHRIST was in and of two Natures, the Armenians understood them to say, that He was in and of two Persons. Otherwise their doctors speak with sufficient clearness on the subject. For thus writes S. Narcissus of Klaens:—

‘ We acknowledge the oneness
Without thereby changing the natures :
But the same Son, Who is GOD from the FATHER,
Is also Man from the Mother :
And we say, that thus there is one Nature (Person)
By means of an union not to be described :
Even as our soul and body are united in one nature.
For although they are only things created,
Yet they form one human nature without any change.
Out of the Immaterial and the Material,
One whole is formed, in an incomprehensible manner.’

One peculiarity of the Armenian Church is its reception of four Canonical books not acknowledged by any other Communion: two in the Old Testament—the History of Joseph and Asenath, and the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs; two in

¹ The above list is not given by Mr. Neale, in his *Introduction to the History of the Holy Eastern Church*. His letters, he tells us, of inquiry, either never reached their destination, or the reply was lost.

the new—the Epistle of the Corinthians to S. Paul, and the Third Epistle of S. Paul to the Corinthians. The former commences thus:—

‘1. Stephen and the elders with him, Dabuas, Eubulus, Theophilus and Zenon, to Paul our father and evangelist, and our faithful master in JESUS CHRIST, health.

‘2. Two men have come to Corinth, Simon by name and Cleopas, who vehemently disturbed the faith of some, with deceitful and corrupt words:

‘3. Of which words thou shouldst inform thyself.

‘4. For neither have we heard such words from thee, nor from the other Apostles.

‘5. But we know only, that what we have heard from thee and from them, we have kept firmly.

‘6. But in this the LORD has had much compassion on us, that, whilst thou art yet with us in the flesh, we shall again hear from thee.

‘7. Therefore do thou write to us, or thyself come to us speedily.

‘8. For we believe in the LORD, that, as it was revealed to our brother Theonas, He hath delivered thee from the hands of the ungodly.

‘9. Now these are the wicked words of these filthy men; for thus say they and teach:

‘10. That we ought not to believe in the prophets:

‘11. Nor to say that GOD is Almighty:

‘12. Nor to believe in the Resurrection of the Body:

‘13. Nor that man was created by GOD alone:

‘14. Nor that JESUS CHRIST was born in the flesh of the Virgin Mary:

‘15. Nor that the world was the handiwork of GOD, but rather of some one of the Angels.’

The work that stands last on our list is a very good *resumé* of the history and rites of the Armenian Church.

(c) The Syrian, or Jacobite Church. The See of Antioch may be said to have five nominal Patriarchs. 1. The Orthodox Possessor, at present Hierotheus, in communion with the rest of the Eastern Church. 2. The so-called Latin Patriarch. 3. The Jacobite, or Monophysite Patriarch, whose seat is at Diarbekr. 4. The Latin Patriarch of the Uniat Jacobites, whose seat is at Mardeen. 5. The Maronite Patriarch. It shows how completely Rome has ignored the old theory of the five-fold aristocracy of the Church, to find that she actually recognises two Patriarchs of the same See; the one, an ornamental Patriarch, residing in Europe, and useful for processions and the like; the other, a Patriarch for the converts of a particular sect, and who does the real work of the See. The Patriarch of the Maronites, she probably would theoretically recognise only as the ecclesiastical chief of that nation. Professor Stanley gives no particulars of the native Jacobite Church of Syria. It has, however, in addition to its Patriarch, at the present moment, eight Metropolitans and three Bishops. 1. Mosul, which gives its title to the Patriarch. 2. Mar Mattai, near Mosul. 3. Diarbekr. 4. Urfah. 5. Kharpoot. 6. Mardeen. 7. Jerusalem. 8, 9. Temeloyo, *Universal*; that is, without a particular See.

10, 11, 12. Ascetic Bishops in Jebel Tori. It is exceedingly difficult to give any guess at the numbers of the Syrian Monophysites, but we overstate them at 200,000. These, too, though never rivalling the Nestorian Missions, yet, in Mediæval times, formed a Communion of no small importance, and can boast writers of great eminence. The chief of these is undoubtedly Gregory Bar-Hebræus, otherwise called Abu'lsaraj, who was born in 1226, and died Maphrian of the East, in 1286. (Maphrian was the title of the second dignitary in the Jacobite Church, a kind of Vice-Patriarch or Catholicos.) His annals are the best and, indeed, only history of the Asiatic Church in the Middle Ages which we possess. Of almost equal celebrity was Dionysius Bar-Salib, Bishop of Amida, who lived from 1140 to 1207. But the learning of the Jacobite Bishops is evinced by no other fact so much as this; the vast number of Liturgies which they composed for their various Churches. Nearly forty of these have been published in a Latin translation, by Renaudot. A friend of the writer of the present article has an almost perfect collection of them in Syriac, which it is earnestly to be hoped may some day see the light.

The Maronites, whose sanctuary is Mount Lebanon, and with whom so fearful a tragedy has, within the last few months, been connected, were, originally, the sole remains of the Monothelite heresy. In the year 1182, by the exertions of the Latin Patriarch of Antioch, Aymeric, they were reconciled to the Roman Church; and now, though their offices are strictly oriental, and, in some respects, unique, they may be called the most ultramontane people under the sun. Besides their Patriarch, they have eight Bishops, one of whom is resident in the Isle of Cyprus, where there are many Maronites.

In connexion with Antioch, we rather wonder that Professor Stanley has not mentioned that very curious sect, the Christians of S. John the Baptist. It is difficult to say, whether they are to be considered heretics or christianising pagans. They profess to be disciples of S. John Baptist; they receive no part of the Bible, except the Psalms; their sacred city is Haran, the city of Abraham; they pay a certain religious worship to the stars; the volume to which they attach most importance, and of which, we believe, a translation has never been published (and travellers are not agreed what is the original language), is called the Testament of Adam; to which we may add, that they are in the habit of very frequent baptism.

From Asia, Professor Stanley takes us to Egypt. There, as it is well known, the Orthodox Church is absolutely extinct; the Patriarch and his three Bishops residing at Constantinople, but without any local cure. The Coptic Patriarch, who lives at

Cairo, is the virtual representative of the proud old Church of Athanasius and Cyril, and has thirteen or fourteen Bishops under him. The sacred language of this communion, now utterly unintelligible to nine-tenths of Egyptian Christians, is the oldest employed by any Church; the same which Moses heard at the court of Pharaoh, and through which he became learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians. One cannot but hope that, in God's mercy, Monophysite though it at present is, there may be a great future for this Church. It has, within the last twenty years, experienced a remarkable revival; all the intellectual offices of Egyptian governments are filled by Copts; they exhibit the most remarkable facility for learning English, so that we have been told of cases, in which a man, who, at the beginning of the year, had never heard an English word, at its end conversed in so perfect an accent, that it was scarcely possible to distinguish him as a foreigner. Then again, the highway from England to India must, more and more, bring the two peoples into contact; and the Bishops of Egypt are now, and have always been, very well disposed towards the English Church.

And, as the daughter of the Coptic Church, we are bound to notice the Ethiopic. Professor Stanley describes this admirably. 'The Church of Abyssinia, founded in the fourth century, by the Church of Alexandria, furnishes the one example of a nation savage, yet Christian; showing us, on the one hand, the force of the Christian faith, in maintaining its superiority at all against such immense disadvantages; and on the other hand, the utmost amount of superstition with which a Christian Church can be overlaid, without perishing altogether. Whatever there is of Jewish or of old Egyptian ritual preserved in the Coptic Church, is carried to excess in the Abyssinian. The likeness of the sacred Ark, called the Ark of Sion, is the centre of Abyssinian devotion. To it, gifts and prayers are offered; on it, the sanctity of the whole Church depends. There, alone, the Jewish Sabbath is still observed, as well as the Christian Sunday; they are the only true Sabbatarians of Christendom. "The sinew that shrank," no less than the flesh of swine, hare, and aquatic fowl, is still forbidden to be eaten. Dancing still forms part of their ritual, as it did in the Jewish temple. The polygamy of the Jewish Church lingers here, after having been banished from the rest of the Christian world.' Our author might have added, that here, alone, is circumcision considered of equal necessity with baptism. 'The endless controversies respecting the natures of CHRIST, which have expired elsewhere, still rage in that barbarous country.' There are no less than sixty-nine different opinions, as to the

manner and extent of the hypostatic union, each of which has its doctors and its enthusiasts, even at the present day, in Abyssinia.

Here our author concludes his list of National Churches—all of them, hitherto, heretical. But we think we have reason to complain, that he has used the two adjectives as if they were synonymous. For he should have added—and the omission is remarkable—the Georgian Church, as a Communion most intensely national, and yet, at the same time, thoroughly orthodox from the beginning. It was, perhaps, not to be avoided, that this lovely country should fall to the protection, at first, and then to the domination of Russia. Its last independent monarch, George XIII., was unable, on his deathbed, to provide in any other way for the safety of his country and its Church. As late as 1795, the Persian armies overran the whole kingdom; the Catholicos, S. Dositheus, was slain in his own church, and his aged and venerable mother, after undergoing the most horrid insults, was roasted alive. It is a pity, that those who have wasted so much compassion on the patriotism of the Circassians, with their religion compounded out of Mahommedanism, a worship of the devil, and a superstitious adoration of the Cross, are not a little better acquainted with the real facts of their history; the hundreds of churches which they have destroyed—the multitudes of priests whom they have tortured to death; the vast territories, once fields and meadows, smiling with Christian cultivation, now deep, dense forests, through their barbarous incursions. Few persons are aware, that Georgia, even at the present day, has mediæval village-churches as frequent as our own; towers, spires, bells, frescoes, wayside crosses, churchyard crosses, tree crosses (a usage, we believe, peculiar to Georgia), and that frequently in the depth of a hitherto unexplored forest, when some new road is being cut out, or timber felled, the workmen come upon a church of the eleventh or twelfth or thirteenth century, perfect even to its lovely mouldings and its curious frescoes. We are quite sure, that, whenever the work shall appear, the *Georgian Travels* of Mr. George Williams will amply repay the study, not only of the ecclesiologist, but of the English Churchman.

And the Georgians may well feel a national pride in their never-broken orthodoxy. There are few nations who can show such royal saints as David III., surnamed the Restorer; Susanna, Princess of Ran and Martyr; and Ketevan, whose glorious confession, under Shah Abbas, filled even the Roman Church with astonishment. There are few more interesting biographies, only at present they are unfortunately shut up in the Russian language, than those of S. Anthony of Marleop, S. Shio of Mgvim, S. Eustatius of Mtsketha, S. Joseph of

Alavverd, and S. Dodo. So great, indeed, is their interest, that when a brief history of the Georgian Church, by M. Jossilian, was published at S. Petersburg in 1843, the first edition of a thousand copies was sold in six weeks; a sale, for Russia, scarcely inferior to that of Macaulay's History, among ourselves.

In proceeding to speak of the Orthodox Eastern Church, and in that, first of the Greek, Professor Stanley has some excellent remarks on the character of the Mother-Church of the world.

The early Roman Church was but a colony of Greek Christians, or Grecised Jews. The earliest fathers of the Western Church, Clemens, Irenæus, Hermas, Hippolytus, wrote in Greek. The early Popes were not Italians, but Greeks; the name of Pope is not Latin, but Greek,—the common, and now despised, title of every pastor in the Eastern Church. * * * * The humblest peasant who reads his Septuagint, or his Greek Testament, in his own mother-tongue, on the hills of Bœotia, may proudly feel, that he has an access to the original oracles of divine truth, which Pope and Cardinal read by a barbarous and imperfect translation.

Most true: we only wish that the magnificent Vulgate had been differently characterised by our writer. The remark about the early Roman Church receives a fitting illustration if we look at the greetings which fill the 16th chapter of the Romans. Let us write down the names mentioned by the Apostle, italicising those that are clearly Greek. *Epenetus, Andronicus, Junia, Amplias, Urban, Stachys, Apelles, Aristobulus, Herodion, Narcissus, Tryphena, Tryphosa, Persis, Rufus, Asyncritus, Phlegon, Hermas, Patrobas, Hermes, Philologus, Julia, Nereus, Olympas.*

Our author groups the Orthodox Churches thus:—

Greece, properly so-called.

The Byzantine Church.

The once barbarian northerns.

(a) Bulgaria and Servia (Slavonic).

Wallachia and Moldavia (Romance).

The last named provinces, Latin in origin, Greek in doctrine, counterbalance Bohemia and Poland, Slavonic in origin, Latin in doctrine.

The Raitzen of Hungary,

The Dalmatian Orthodox,

the westernmost outposts of the Eastern Church.

(b) Russia.

To these he should have added, as we have remarked, Georgia, as having a distinct nationality; Orthodox Syria; and Jerusalem. It is true that the orthodox in the latter Patriarchate are little more than a Greek colony, and that since the sixteenth century, no native Christian has ascended the throne of S. James. But the Syrian Church has considerable vitality; and its late eminent Patriarch, Methodius, the greatest and holiest man who had for centuries filled the throne of

S. Ignatius, did much to reinvigorate his province. We believe that the population of the various dioceses has never yet been published in this country ; it may interest some of our readers, and we can vouch for its accuracy.

Tyre and Sidon	5,600
Damascus	4,800
Berrhœa (Aleppo)	8,000
Epiphania	4,160
Laodicea	4,000
Seleucia and Heliopolis	2,000
Amida (Diarbekr)	500
Tripoli	7,800
Bostra	50
Emessa	3,200
Berytus	20,000
Adana	1,400
Acre (the Antiochene diocese of that name)	12,080
Palmyra	(<i>titular</i>)
Theodosiopolis (Erzeroum)	50
	73,640

Lamentable as is this total, in comparison with the days of Antioch's glory, it yet is vastly superior to the number of the still existing Monophysites within the same dioceses ; and it is, therefore, unfair, in all ways, to speak of these latter as the exclusive National Church.

IV. The Professor next proceeds to compare the general tendencies of Eastern and Western Churches. Making allowance for the unavoidably rough and trenchant nature of an apophthegm, he observes, truly enough, that 'the Western Theology' is essentially logical in form, and based on law ; the Eastern 'is rhetorical in form, and based on philosophy. Hence the 'disputes and heresies of the East have been, strictly speaking, 'in *theology*—relating not to man, but to God: and they (with 'the exception of the Arian) have raged but little in the 'West.' Our author, however, speaks a little unguardedly on this point, since the Aquileian and Istrian Churches formed a schism which lasted a hundred and fifty years, rather than receive the condemnation of the Three Chapters, as derogatory to the Council of Chalcedon.

Again: in the eleventh century, Germany was warmly agitated by a controversy on the use of certain expressions, which were supposed to be Nestorian ; and the defenders of the Catholic doctrine,¹ in some cases, used language which cannot

¹ A history of this controversy, which is of some importance, remains to be written. The usual Church historians, Baronius, Fleury, Natalis Alexander, Cabassutius, say little or nothing of it. It came to a crisis in the Council of Babenberg, A. D. 1151. The best accounts of it that we know are to be found in (a) Hansiz, *Germania Sacra*, tom. ii. (the History of Salzburg), pp. 228—252 ; and (b) in the Preface of Pez to vol. v. of the *Anecdota*.

be vindicated from a charge of Monophysitism. Neither must the Adoptionist controversy, in Spain (a strictly *theological* one, if any ever were) be forgotten.

It is more universally true, that the Pelagian and Predestinarian controversies never created any interest in the East, where the endless disputes on 'merit,' 'demerit,' 'satisfaction,' 'imputed righteousness,' 'inherent righteousness,' are quite unknown.

V. We must be briefer when we allude to the Professor's observations on the Sacramental differences between the two great Churches. It is not wonderful that he calls the change, by which Confirmation has been transferred from infancy to youth, 'a salutary innovation.' It ought always, however, to be remembered, that it is an alteration even later than the disuse of the chalice, and that it was at first introduced in compliance with simply Pelagian arguments. It is worth while noting, that the custom of the Spanish Church (at least in many of its larger cities), a Church so curiously, in some respects, approximating to, as curiously in others diverging from, the maxims of the East, places Confirmation at the age of three years. So in the administration of the Holy Eucharist, once and no more, to infants, most undoubtedly the primitive practice, our author strongly approves the very late modern change. In the less authoritative and more precatory form of absolution, Professor Stanley seems to claim some kind of affinity for the East with Protestant views. Would he,—it was well said to us,—be content to have our Prayer-Books, as the Euchologies are, stamped on the outside with the Seven Sacraments, *μετάνοια* claiming its place as one? We rather wonder that he has not alluded to the difference of position at the reception of the Blessed Sacrament. Considering that, at the time of the Reformation, the custom of kneeling had an origin not further removed from Cranmer and Ridley than they from us, we must ever look at it as a special interference of God's good providence, that the earlier—and for a thousand years universal—practice was not restored. What a handle would the change have afforded for future Zwinglianism! No; while practices, good or bad, of an earlier date were ruthlessly swept away, this, the especial object of Puritan attack, was obstinately maintained. We do not call to mind any examples in English Ecclesiology where a font or a capital represents a standing reception; but in France such a representation is not uncommon, even down to the twelfth century.

Into the question of the Double Procession, on which Canon Stanley has a brief appendix, we will not go.

VI. The next lectures treat of Nicæa and Athanasius. They

are, on the whole, the ablest and by far the most picturesque of these lectures. But what particular connexion, as we have said before, that Synod has with the East, when compared with *e.g.* the Quinisext, or the Seventh, or Florence, or Bethlehem, we do not see. We must suppose that, having well got up the subject, our Professor thought this a favourable opportunity of producing his notes. Only we must enter our strongest protest against the—we know not whether more unjust or more laughable—comparison, which finds in Professor Jowett another Athanasius,—in Mr. Mansell a second Arius. The picturesque style of the detail may be quoted from the following extract.

‘In the close of the month of May, 1853, it was my good fortune to be descending, in the moonlight of an early morning, from the high wooded steepes of one of the mountain-ranges of Bithynia. As the dawn rose, and as we approached the foot of these hills, through the thick mists which lay over the plain, there gradually broke upon our view the two features which mark the city of Nicæa.

‘Beneath us lay the long inland lake—the Ascanian Lake, which, communicating at its western extremity by a small inlet with the Sea of Marmora, fills up almost the whole valley—itsself a characteristic of the conformation of this part of Asia Minor. Such another is the Lake of Apollonias, seen from the summit of the Mysian Olympus. Such another is the smaller lake, seen in traversing the plain on the way from Broussa.

‘At the head of the lake appeared the oblong space inclosed by the ancient walls, of which the rectangular form indicates with unmistakable precision the original founders of the city. It was the outline given to all the oriental towns, built by the successors of Alexander and their imitators. Antioch, Damascus, Philadelphia, Sebaste, Palmyra, were all constructed on the same model of a complete square, intersected by four straight streets, adorned with a colonnade on each side. This we know to have been the appearance of Nicæa, as founded by Lysimachus, and rebuilt by Antigonus. And this is still the form of the present walls; which, although they inclose a larger space than the first Greek city, yet are evidently as early as the time of the Roman Empire, little later, if at all, than the reign of Constantine. Within their circuit all is now a wilderness; over broken columns and through tangled thickets, the traveller with difficulty makes his way to the wretched Turkish village of Is-nik, which occupies the centre of the vacant space. In the midst of this village, surrounded by a few ruined mosques, on whose summits stand the never-failing storks of the deserted cities of the East, remains a solitary Christian church, dedicated to “The Repose of the Virgin.” Within the church is a rude picture, commemorating the one event which, amidst all the vicissitudes of Nicæa, has secured for it an immortal name.

‘To delineate this event, to transport ourselves back into the same season of the year,—the chestnut woods, then, as now, green with the first burst of summer, the same sloping hills, the same tranquil lake, the same snow-capped Olympus from far brooding over the whole scene, but in every other respect, how entirely different!—will be my object in this lecture.

‘From the island of Cyprus there arrived the old shepherd Spiridion, a shepherd both before and after his elevation to the episcopate. Strange stories were told by his fellow-islanders to the historian Socrates of the thieves who were miraculously caught in attempting to steal his sheep, and of Spiridion’s good-humoured reply when he found them in the morning,

and gave them a ram, that they might not have sat up all night for nothing. Another tale, exactly similar to the fantastic Mussulman legends which hang about the sacred places of Jerusalem, told how he had gained an answer from his dead daughter, Irene, to tell where a certain deposit was hidden. Two less marvellous, but more instructive stories, bring out the simplicity of his character. He rebuked a celebrated preacher at Cyprus for altering, in a quotation from the Gospels, the homely word for "bed," into "couch." "What! are you better than He who said 'bed,' that you are ashamed to use His words?" On occasion of a wayworn traveller coming to him in Lent, finding no other food in the house, he presented him with salted pork, and on the stranger's declining, saying that he could not as a Christian break his fast—"So much the less reason," he said, "have you for scruple; to the pure all things are pure."

'These wonderful powers were exerted, it was reported, actually on his journey to the Council. One night he, with a cavalcade of Orthodox Bishops, arrived at a caravanserai, where, as it so chanced, a party of Arians were assembled, also on their way to Nicæa. The Arians determined to seize this opportunity of intercepting the further progress of so formidable an accession to their rivals. Accordingly, in the dead of night, they cut off the heads of all the horses belonging to Spiridion and his companions. When, as is the custom in oriental journeying, the travellers rose to start before break of day, the Orthodox Bishops were dismayed at the discovery of what had befallen their steeds. A word from Spiridion, however, was sufficient to rectify the difficulty. He replaced the decapitated heads, and his party proceeded on their journey. When day broke they found that the miracle, performed in the dark and in haste, had restored the heads at random—black heads to white shoulders, white heads to black shoulders; in short, a caravan of piebald horses.

'Many more stories might be told of him, but, to use the words of an ancient writer, who has related some of them, "from the claws you can make out the lion." Of all the Nicene fathers it may yet be said, that, in a certain curious sense, he is the only one who has survived the decay of time. After resting for many years in his native Cyprus, his body was transferred to Constantinople, where it remained till the capture by the Turks. It was thence conveyed to Corfu, where it is still preserved in the cathedral of that island. Hence, by a strange resuscitation of fame, he has become the patron saint, one might almost say the divinity, of the Ionian Islands. Once a year, in solemn procession, he is carried round the streets of Corfu. Hundreds of Corfiotes bear his name, now abridged into the familiar diminutive of "Spiro." The superstitious veneration entertained for the old saint is a constant source of quarrel between the English residents and the native Ionians. But the historian may be pardoned for gazing, with a momentary interest, on the dead hands, now black and withered, that subscribed the Creed of Nicæa.'

Then follows a lecture on Mahometanism; which, both on literary and theological grounds, we heartily wish omitted. But after the—now celebrated—article which appeared long since in our own pages, and to which, in its published form, we would earnestly refer the reader, it would be a work of super-erogation for us to speak on the subject.

The rest of the volume is taken up by the Russian Church; and we will return to that, for the purpose of offering a few remarks on it, when we have first said something of the other volumes mentioned at the head of the present article.

VII. It is scarcely possible to overrate the value of the 'Acts of the Constantinopolitan Patriarchate,' from 1315 to 1402, as edited from Viennese MSS. by the distinguished scholars Miklosich and Müller. They were brought, about 1550, to Vienna from Constantinople, by Augerius Ghislain de Busbecke, where they have lain since, unconsulted and almost unknown. They are referred to, however, by Lambeccius, in his 'Notes on the Imperial Library at Vienna' (viii. 1065), in the *журналъ народнаго просвѣщенія* (1847), and in the 'Slavische Bibliothek' (i. 123—158). The view they give of the intense energy of the Byzantine Church, in that century which is usually considered the age of its miserable decrepitude, the curious way in which titles are the more closely clung to, the more the meaning of those titles is gone, yet also the real loving piety of a time in which the Eastern Church is commonly considered a mere heap of formality, and the very curious character of some of the cases here detailed, make the publication invaluable. We will give a few specimens of the documents in question, which run through a series of eleven Patriarchs: John XIII. (Glycys), Isaiah, John XIV. (Calecas), Isidore, Callistus I. and Philotheus, Nilus, Antonius, Macarius, Callistus II., Matthew.

We may remark, that the greater part of this period is celebrated for the controversy between the fanatic or dreamer Gregory Palamas, on the one hand; and, on the other, Barlaam and Acindynus, as to the Uncreated Light of Mount Tabor; to the Palamitic view of which the Throne of Constantinople allowed itself to be pledged. It is nominally so to this day; but we believe that, actually, the commemoration of Gregory is, except in some few places, forbidden.

The documents are sometimes decisions of the Patriarchal Council (signed by from ten to thirty metropolitans and bishops), sometimes of the Patriarch alone; sometimes ecclesiastical edicts of the Emperor, sometimes professions of faith. The decisions are both in public and private matters; the latter usually concerns wills, marriages, or adoptions.

The names of many of these Prelates were unknown before: and we may notice a point connected with them. Our own first duty—as it would be that of every student of the Eastern Church—was to enter the names of the various Bishops who at different times formed the Byzantine Synod, and which occur there only, into our copy of Lequien. While, of course, these filled a great many vacancies in his noble work, they never convicted him of error, except in one solitary instance; and even in that we can see a very possible explanation. To those who know the character of Lequien's book, and the nature

of such synodical signatures, this proof of accuracy will, if possible, raise even higher than it stands at present the reputation of the great scholar of Boulogne: the rather that he had not lived to make his last corrections.

The Greek is sometimes very singular, and shows the deep decadence of the language. Thus, in 1315, a certain monk, Joannicius, after having been condemned for some crime, promises never again to celebrate, in the following words—a copy exactly (it is the fifteenth document).

† Ἐγὼ μοναχὸς Ἰωαννίκιος ὑπόσχομαι διὰ τῆς παρουσίας μου ἐγγράφου ἀσφάλειας, ἐπεὶ ἔπραξα ἀνόσιον ἔργον καὶ ἀφηρέθην τὴν ἱερασίην μου, ἀπὸ τοῦδε κε εἰς τὸ ἐξῆς οὐ μὴ γυρεύσω, ἵνα καὶ πάλιν ἱεουργήσω. Εἰ δέ ποτε φαραθὸ εἰς τοῦτο τὴν ἐμφάνειαν τῆς παρουσίας μου ἐγγράφου ἀσφάλειας, ἵνα εἰμὶ ὑπεύθυνος τι δικαία κρίσις τῆς ἀγίας τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκκλησίας διὰ γὰρ τοῦτο κε τὴν παροῦσαν μου ἐγγράφου ἀσφάλειαν πεποίηκα.

Poor Joannicius! it is almost too hard a measure to be so pilloried half a millennium after he has rested well in some Thracian or Asiatic church, probably now a mosque!

Then, again: we have many and many such a melancholy notification as No. xvii., which appears to bear date 1316, and where the Bishop of Sinope is made Prelate of the churches of Side, Sylæum and Leontopolis, long widowed through the devastation of the barbarians. And xviii., where the Bishop of Zaleucus is set over the Church of Amasea. All these examples, while remarkably resembling the state, contrast as remarkably with the proceedings, of the Roman Church, 900 years previously. Then, in like manner, her outlying dependencies were overrun with barbarians; but instead of agglomerating titles of distant extinct sees on one non-resident Bishop, she sent out her vigorous missionaries to fight Satan on his own ground; and they were victorious. Her bishoprics came back to her with new young life, with new fresh language. The winning back conquered provinces is her point of triumph over her Eastern Sisters; the retaining what she had once, in her new endeavours, won, is her Eastern Sisters' glory over her.

What would the Privy Council say, if, instead of the Westerton and Liddell case, it had to pronounce judgment on the following?

There was at Lacedæmon, in April, 1316, a lady named Euphrosyne Marina, who, having embraced the religious life, had the half property of an image of the Virgin the Hodegetria; the other moiety was vested in the Bishop of Cernitza, Malotaras. Of these, it seems, one wished to place the icon in one church, one in another. The matter made a great stir in those parts, and very great men interfered. No less a person than Kyr Andronicus Palæologus, the governor of

Peloponnesus, tried what he could do; so did the venerable Kyr Manuel Stephanites; so did the venerable Kyr the Kalodikes, and others more. But the more they tried, the worse they sped. So the case came before the synod. There were John XIII., the Metropolitans of Heraclea, Sardis, Nicomedia, Nicæa, Chalcedon, Monembasia, Pontoheracleia, Prusa, Pergamos, Christopolis, Dyrrachium, Bizya, Kius, Media. The lady, as usual, had her own way.

One wonders only how the ordinary diocesan business of such of these sees as were not *in partibus infidelium* could have been carried on, with the continual interruption of such general proceedings.

Again: there are several investigations connected with the heresy of the Bogomili. A history of this sect, the Albigenses of the East, has yet to be written; and when it is, the present diplomata will afford a good deal of interesting matter. In June, 1316, one Carianus, a priest, comes before the synod. He seems to have been a thoroughly *mauvais sujet*. Not prospering in his profession, he tendered his services, for a consideration, to the Patarenes. They offered, and he accepted—the terms might puzzle a merely classical student—*ὑπέρπυρα πεντήκοντα καὶ ἄλογον* i.e. *fifty gold pieces* (worth about thirty shillings each) *and a horse*.¹ Having apparently got all he could obtain from this sect, he laid his hands on a drinking-cup, a spoon (*χουλιάριον*—the French *cuiller*), and their code² of laws, or of belief, which he hid in his hat. After various adventures, this worthy reached Constantinople, and was fortunate enough to get absolved.

A curious insight is obtained through these papers into the abuse which, in the East as in the West (though not to the same extent), encouraged the exemption of monasteries from Diocesan authority, and their immediate subjection to the Œcumenical throne. Thus, in October, 1318, we find the Metropolitan of Prusa invested with a kind of legantine authority to visit the province of Amasæa, and especially the 'patriarchal' Monastery of Agaura therein situated. In the same year, the Bishop of Larissa claims diocesan rights over the Monastery of Marmarianæ. The Archimandrite pleads patriarchal exemption; and the cause is decided in his favour. That exemption has always been held singularly dear: witness

¹ *ἵππος ἐστὶ τὸ ἄλογον, ἵππεῖς οἱ καβαλλάροι* says a MS. lexicon, under Schedographia.

² So we understand *μαγάρισμος*, though the expression is anything but clear. The word originally meant apostasy to the Agarenes (Mahometans); then, any kind of apostasy (and so it is often used of Iconoclasm); and then, the proof or sign or means of apostasy.

the endeavours of the larger French monasteries, in the seventh and eighth and ninth centuries, to be declared 'royal,' i.e. responsible, not to the Bishop, but to the 'Arch-chaplain' ¹ of the palace.

Then, again, we have singular catalogues of 'patriarchal possessions,' which seem to include churches to which the Patriarch had the right of presentation in various dioceses. About 1320, in the comparatively small island of Lemnos there are no less than twenty-five! What must have been the enormous wealth of Constantinople in the height of its worldly glory! Further, we have the method by which a Bishopric was converted into a Metropolis. Thus, in 1323, the Emperor, Andronicus the Elder, wished thus to elevate Bysis. First we have the imperial document, δι' ἐρυθρῶν γραμμάτων; then its confirmation by Isaiah: to the latter document is sometimes, in the like cases, added a similar confirmation by the Synod.

In 1325 we have a singular trial, again connected with the Bogomili. One Dorotheus, from the Monastery of CHRIST the Philocalus in Thessalonica, was subject to epileptic fits, and had tried the then resources of physic to little purpose. He next betook himself to the heresy which was so prevalent in those parts; and he was taught by its professors, εἶπερ, ἀπαλλαγὴν ἐθέλοι τοῦ συνέχοντος πάθους εὐρεῖν, μίαναι τὸ τῶν ἁγίων θεοφανίων ἁγίασμα καὶ ἐκ τούτου πιεῖν· καὶ τοῖς τούτου λόγοις παρασυρεῖς καὶ τὴν γνώμην ματαιωθείς ἐτόλμησε τὴν τοιαύτην μυσαρὰν πράξιν, μή τις λαβόντος αἰσθῆσιν τῶν ἐν τῇ μονῇ. The poor man died; but the question was, what should be done to one of his fellows, who had been made acquainted with the sacrilege and had not revealed it? The Synod suspend him for six months.

The Metropolitan of Philippi is accused of immorality, in July, 1337, under John XIV. (Calecas). Certainly, the quaint fashion in which the depositions of the ecclesiastics are given is worth quoting. One example may serve for all:—

Ἐγὼ ὁ ἱερομόναχος Γρηγόριος λέγω· εὐλογητὸς ὁ Θεὸς καὶ Πατὴρ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ὁ ὢν εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας· οὐ ψεύδομαι, καὶ ὁμνῶ εἰς τα ἅγια τοῦ Θεοῦ εὐαγγέλια, ὅτι εἶδον τὴν Πετραλοιφίαν εἰσαγομένην κατὰ πρῶτον ἕκτον παρὰ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τοῦ μητροπολίτου, τοῦ Ἀλβανίτου Μιχαῆλ, διὰ τῆς αὐλῆς τοῦ μοναστηρίου εἰς τὸ κέλλιον τοῦ μητροπολίτου, ἀνδρῶα φοροῦσαν ἐνδύματα, καὶ πάλιν ἐξιούσαν μετ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ Ἀλβανίτου κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦ ὄρθρου, ὡσαύτως ἔβλεπον αὐτὴν καὶ κατὰ διαφόρ. vs ἡμέρας εἰσερχομένην καὶ ἐξερχομένην φανερώς.

¹ No better account can be given of these attempts than that which is to be found in the Abbé Piolin's *Histoire de l'Eglise du Mans*, and especially in his biography of S. Aldric, in the second volume. Such a book we may vainly look for as regards the Churches of England. We have no wish to speak with disrespect of Dr. Hook's work; but—the marvellous difference!

Τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τοῦ μητροπολίτου! And so, all the 'super-illustriousness' usually attached to the lowest Bishop is dropped, and the defendant, prelate of a great Church, simply becomes 'the man, the Metropolitan.'

The next document, July, 1339, introduces us to a new branch of the Eastern Church. John XIV. replies to the Metropolitan of Russia, thus:—

'Most holy Metropolitan of Rhosia, and most excellent: in the HOLY GHOST beloved brother of our meanness, and sylliturgist. Grace and peace from GOD be with thy Holiness. We have received an epistle from thy Holiness, entering into details, and giving a complete account concerning thy predecessor in the same most holy Church; how since his death he hath been glorified by GOD, and manifested to be His true servant, insomuch that mighty wonders have been wrought by him, and cures of all kinds performed. We are glad, and rejoice spiritually on this account, and have offered to GOD the praise. But since thy Holiness also desireth to learn from us what ought to be done with these holy relics, thyself well knowest, how it is a part of the order and custom of Holy Church, when full and indubitable proof of such a matter has been produced, to act. Thou wilt honour and glorify with hymns and doxologies the servant of GOD,—and for all future time celebrate his memory to the praise of the GOD Who glorifieth those that glorify Him: Whose grace be with thy Holiness.—July: Indict. ζ †.'

The deceased Metropolitan was S. Peter; the correspondent of the Patriarch was Theognostes, a Greek by birth.

There is a really lovely letter (xcii.), undated, addressed by the same John XIV. to the inhabitants of Nicæa, now in the power of the Mahometans, and exhorting them to stand fast in the faith:—*εἰ γὰρ καὶ κυριεύουσιν ὑμῶν οἱ ἐχθροὶ, ἀλλὰ τῶν οἰκειῶν ψυχῶν καὶ τῆς γνώμης αὐτοὶ ἑαυτῶν ἐστὲ κύριοι.* It is the only communication of the kind in the volume.

We have (p. 263) some very singular epistles from John Cantacuzene to the Metropolitan of Kieff, and to Demetrius Ljubat, Prince of Vladimir, which show how completely the Byzantine Emperor felt himself entitled to make ecclesiastical changes in Russia. This proves that Mouravieff's history of that period must be received with some degree of caution.

In consequence of the controversy on the Uncreated Light, several of the condemned party took refuge in the Latin Church. Some of them returned from it: the recantation of one Philip Lomelini is worth quoting, from the oddity of the Greek—evidently written by ear.

† Πιστέβω ἰς ἕνα θεόν, κ. τ. λ. Ἐποῖ δὲ νύπιος φανυστοῖς προσεμύνα τοῖ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῶν Λατίνων καὶ ὑπὸ πλάωσις καὶ ἀπάτοις καὶ ἀγνώσις ἐνομιζῶν ὀρθὰ ἔνε πρὸς τὴν εὐσεβῆ καὶ ὀρθοδόξων πίστην πάντα, ὅσα ἐν ἐκείνοι λέγεται περὶ τοῦ παναγίου πνεύματος καὶ ἴσα ἐν ἐκοίνοι τελλοῦντε, ἐπὶ οὐ ὑπὸ ἀγνώσις ἔστερων ἔκονα, νῦν ἀπόβάλλομε καὶ ἀρνοῦμε πάντα, ὡς κακόδοξα καὶ ἑρετικῶν ἔργα τε καὶ φρονήματα, προσερχῶμε δὲ καθαρῶς καὶ γνῶσις ὑς τὴν ἀγίαν τοῦ Χριστοῦ καθολικὴν καὶ ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ ὁμολογῶ κατὰ τὴν ἀπόφασιν τοῦ κυρίου

καὶ θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου συμβόλου τὸ ἐκ μόνου τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορέβεσται τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ἀποβάλλομε καὶ ἀρνοῦμε καὶ πάντα τὰ λυπὰ ἐκείνων ἔθιμα, τὰ τε ἐκκλησιαστικά καὶ τὰ περὶ τοῖς λυπῇς αὐτῶν πολυτίας, στέργω δέ, ἅπερ ἡ ἀγία τοῦ Χριστοῦ καθολικοῖ καὶ ἀποστολικοῖ ἐκκλησία φρονεῖ καὶ λέγει περὶ αὐτῶν, καὶ ἡμεῖς καὶ ἐγὼ ἰς τῶν ὀρθοδόξων χριστιανῶν καὶ μαθητοῖς τοῖς ἐκκλησίας. καὶ ἰς τὴν περὶ τούτων ἀσφάλειαν ἐπιστάσαν μοι τὴν παρούσαν μου ὁμολογίαν, ὑπογράψας αὐτὴν οἰκωρίως, μηνὶ Ἰουνίου, α', ἔνδ. ἡ †.

† Ἐγὼ ὁ Φίλλειπος Λομεληνός †.

These are some of the more interesting parts of this work. That of MM. Rallé and Potle we hope to consider more at length on some future occasion; and will not enter into a book of so much importance at the end of an article.

We will now return to Professor Stanley. The last part of his work is on Russia:—and though rather ‘got up,’ it is interesting, and on the whole correct. The first lecture is on the Early Church of Muscovy. He quotes, as ‘the genuine portraiture of a Russian Christian of early days,’ the testament of Vladimir Monomachus, who married the daughter of our Harold.

“If you find yourself affected by any ailment, make three prostrations to the ground before the Lord; and never let the sun find you in bed. At the dawn of day, my father, and the virtuous men by whom he was surrounded, did thus: they glorified the Lord, and cried, in the joy of their hearts, ‘Vouchsafe, O my God, to enlighten me with thy divine light.’ They then seated themselves to deliberate, or to administer justice to the people, or they went to the chase; and in the middle of the day they slept; which God permits to man as well as to beasts and birds.

“For my part, I accustomed myself to do everything that I might have ordered my servants to do. Night and day, summer and winter, I was perpetually moving about. I wished to see everything with my own eyes. Never did I abandon the poor or the widow to the oppressions of the powerful. I made it my duty to inspect the churches and the sacred ceremonies of religion, as well as the management of my property, my stables, and the vultures and hawks of my hunting establishment.

“I have made eighty-three campaigns and many expeditions. I concluded nineteen treaties with the Poloctzy. I took captive one hundred of their princes, whom I set free again; and I put two hundred of them to death, by throwing them into rivers.

“No one has ever travelled more rapidly than I have done. Setting out in the morning from Tchernigof, I have arrived at Kieff before the hour of vespers.

“In my youth, what falls from my horse did I not experience! wounding my feet and my hands, and breaking my head against trees. But the Lord watched over me.

“In hunting amidst the thickest forests, how many times have I myself caught wild horses and bound them together! How many times have I been thrown down by buffaloes, wounded by the antlers of stags, and trodden under the feet of elks! A furious wild boar rent my sword from my baldric: my saddle was torn to pieces by a bear; this terrible beast rushed upon my courser, whom he threw down upon me. But the Lord protected me.

“O, my children, fear neither death nor wild beasts. Trust in Providence: it far surpasses all human precautions.”

The second lecture is on the Russian Church of the Middle Ages. The third on the Great Patriarch Nikon; and the fourth on the Dissenters or Rascolniks. (*Rascolot*, to split; *rascol*, schism; *rascolnik*, schismatic.) The author of 'Le Raskol' gives a fair account of these people, who take their rise from the reformation introduced by Nikon in the seventeenth century.

'Le schisme s'était partagé tout d'abord en deux branches bien distinctes et qui en forment jusqu'à présent les deux divisions principales: les Popovtzi, secte qui reconnaît l'autorité d'un clergé, et les Bezpopovtzi, c'est-à-dire ceux qui n'ont point de prêtres. Les Popovtzi, conservant quelques idées d'ordre et d'organisation, veulent que leur religion ait ses ministres; ils croient avec raison qu'une Église sans prêtres n'est pas une Église. Aussi, après la réforme de Nikon, conservèrent-ils d'anciens popes, qui avaient reçu l'onction d'évêques exiles. Puis la nécessité les poussa à admettre les prêtres de l'Église officielle que des motifs divers chassaient de leurs diocèses. Ils ne les recevaient toutefois qu'après une certaine purification conforme à leurs idées, après des prières expiatoires, et un acte plus significatif, consistant à cracher, en signe de mépris, sur l'Église dont ils faisaient jadis partie. Plus tard les Popovtzi, simplifiant le mode d'intronisation de leurs ministres, acclamèrent le premier venu qui sut mériter leur sympathie en se pliant à leurs exigences.

'Les Bezpopovtzi, comme leur nom l'indique, n'ont pas de clergé; ils soutiennent que, puisque Dieu n'a pas permis à des évêques de faire partie de leur Église, ils ne sauraient avoir de prêtres; ceux-ci n'ayant de qui tenir leur pouvoir.

'Les vieillards les plus vertueux doivent leur lire les Saintes-Écritures. C'est à ces formes élémentaires que leur sacerdoce est ordinairement ramené. Quelquefois, dans cette secte, hommes et femmes s'enferment dans des chapelles et y attendent au milieu de l'obscurité et du silence qu'un prêtre leur soit révélé par le ciel. Ils s'abstiennent de la communion, font baptiser leurs enfants par les sages-femmes, se marient et divorcent à volonté. La base du mariage, disent-ils, étant l'accord des fiancés, et l'amour, dont la nature est divine, devant régler la durée de l'union des cœurs, il en résulte naturellement que les liens conjugaux doivent cesser du libre consentement des époux et quand l'amour a disparu.

'Ces deux branches principales du Raskol, les Popovtzi et les Bezpopovtzi, se subdivisèrent en une foule de rameaux secondaires.

'Le premier, parmi les Popovtzi, qui fit secte à part, fut Abbacume; puis vient Onoufri, fondateur de la secte appelée Onoufrievtchina; Étienne donna son nom aux Stéphaniens, etc.—

'Dans la secte des Bezpopovtzi, l'union de Théodose, l'union de Philippe, etc., formèrent des divisions sur lesquelles on peut trouver des détails intéressants dans des ouvrages bien connus.'—*Le Raskol*, pp. 14—16.

Professor Stanley gives an interesting account of a service of the Bezpopoffchins.

'The approaches of their milder brethren to the Establishment they regard, naturally, as a base compromise with Babylon. In many respects, the ritual of the two sects is the same. In both buildings alike we see the same gigantic faces, the same antique forms. But, unlike the chapel of the Popoffchins, or any church of the Establishment, the screen on which these pictures hang, the *iconostasis*, is not a partition opening into a sanctuary beyond, but is the abrupt and undisguised termination of the church itself.

You advance, thinking to pass, as in the ordinary churches, through the painted screen to the altar, and you find that you are stopped by a dead wall. In front of this wall—this screen which is not a screen (so let me describe the service which I there witnessed, on the eve of the anniversary of the Coronation)—an aged layman, with a long sectarian beard, chanted in a cracked voice such fragments of the service as are usually performed by the deacon; and from the body of the church a few scattered worshippers (their scantiness probably occasioned by the refusal of the sect to recognise the great State festival) screamed out the responses, bowing the head and signing the cross in their peculiar way as distinctly as so slight a difference will permit. That scanty congregation, venerable from their very eccentricity, that worship in the dim light of the truncated church, before the vacant wall which must constantly remind them of the loss of the very part of the ceremonial which they consider most essential, is the most signal of all triumphs of the letter that kills over the spirit that quickens; a truly Judaic faith, united with a truly Judaic narrowness, such as no Western nation could hope to produce. It shows us the legitimate conclusion of those who insist on turning either forms, or the rejection of forms, into principles, and on carrying out principles so engendered to their full length.

‘That the Russian Church, containing elements such as these, should have survived at all the shock of Peter’s revolution, is a proof of no slight vitality. But, after the first convulsion was over, it became apparent that (taking them as a whole) the religious feelings and the religious institutions of the country had embraced the change, and moved along with it. Many of the clergy did for a time make a stiff resistance; the unfortunate Alexis fell a victim to his intimacy with some of the disaffected Bishops; the Old Believers broke out into open rebellion; one of them attempted Peter’s life; some thousands of them, in the reign of the Empress Anne, intrinched themselves in the convent fortress of Solovetzky, and died, fighting to the last gasp, like the remnant of the Jewish people in the war of independence.’—*Lectures on the History of the Eastern Church*, pp. 482, 483.

We are bound to say, however, that Professor Stanley under-rates the importance of Nikon’s reforms; representing them as almost simply ritual. In truth, the text of the Slavonic Liturgy was horribly corrupt. A copy of the Rascolnik *Sloujebnek* lies before us as we write. It is a very handsome edition, got up, we are informed, by Government for the use of these poor people; and with a truly Apostolic forbearance, the Holy Greek Synod has, of late, permitted an Orthodox Priest to officiate according to it. Of course, only the Popoffchins will avail themselves of his services. But the book might be thus represented in English, if we may take a passage from our own Prayer-Book.

Dearly beloved brethren, the Scripture proveth¹ us in sundrie² places to know-
ledge³ and confess our manifold sins and
wickedness: and that we should not as-
semble⁴ nor cloke them before the face of
Almighty GOD our heavenly Fadyr:⁵ but
confess them, &c.

¹ moveth. ² sundry.

³ acknowledge.

⁴ dissemble.

⁵ Father.

At the end of the Professor's volume we have a very good plan of the Uspensky Cathedral, in Moscow—the Mount Athos of Russian devotion; built by Aristotle of Bologna, 1475—1479, and crowded with the tombs of the sainted prelates of Moscow. There is also a map of the Eastern Church, tinted according to its different branches.

We now take an unwilling leave of a very interesting work. Here and there, as was natural, the Professor allows his own views to crop out, but, with the exception of the amusing parallels to Messrs. Mansell and Jowett, nowhere offensively. If the Lectures do not exhibit, neither do they pretend to, a very deep acquaintance with the Eastern Church; and probably they are all the more popular, and so all the more useful, on that very account; while the interest of the word-painting they contain is not inferior to the other writings of the accomplished author of 'Sinai and Palestine.'

P.S. *The SHORTER NOTICES of the Books of the Quarter are postponed,
by the illness of the Editor.*

6, PATERNOSTER ROW,
26th June, 1861.

THE
CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER.

OCTOBER, 1861.

ART. I.—1. 1 and 2 *Victoria*, c. 106; 3 and 4 *Victoria*, c. 86.

2. *A Bill for establishing Diocesan Courts and Courts of Appeal for the Branch of the United Church of England and Ireland in New Zealand.* Printed in New Zealand.

3. 3 *Burns' Eccles. Law*, ed. *Phillimore*, title '*Privileges and Restraints of the Clergy.*'

THE power of the spiritual governors of the Church to enforce her teaching by the exercise of discipline over those committed to her care, is a subject of the deepest interest to the members of a Christian State.

It is a subject which requires, for its due examination, to be considered from various points of view, in order that the confused and loose notions generally prevalent respecting it may be avoided. In a *general sense* this power is obviously inseparable from her existence.

The end of her being, so to speak, is the correction and bettering of mankind; to chasten the vicious, to tame the rebellious, to reclaim the erring, are among the principal objects of her divine institution.¹

To attain these ends she had *within herself* means of great efficacy; she could refuse to the impenitent her ministrations and her sacraments, and as a punishment in the last resort could shut him out altogether in life and death from her communion.

The Apostles who exercised this power transmitted their authority to their successors the Bishops.² The Church, however, as such, could attach no civil penalties or punishments to transgressors; these were *without herself*, and it was but rarely, even after her union with the State, that she invoked in aid of her spiritual censure the secular arm.

¹ S. Matthew xviii. 15—18; 2 Corinth. xiii. 2—10.

² Tit. ii. 15; 1 Tim. v. 20.

It is not, however, with this general view of the authority of the Church to exercise discipline over all *fideles*, clergy and laity, that we are at present concerned. It is the narrower and more confined sense of discipline exercised by the spiritual governors of the Church over her ordained ministers, over the clergy, that we are desirous of now submitting to the consideration of our readers. The authority in this matter belonged, from the very nature and reason of the thing, to the overseers of the Church; it was recognised as so belonging in the laws of the earliest Christian emperors, and has ever continued to be so, with more or less restrictions, in every Christian State.

The sacred character of the priest's office, the unspeakable importance of his duties, the grave consequences resulting from their neglect or profanation, demanded from the bishop a closer and more vigilant inspection into the life of the priest than it was competent or necessary for him to institute into the life of the layman. It was an exaggeration of this reasoning, in itself just, which led to the demand of the spiritual governors of the Church to exercise exclusive jurisdiction over all crimes committed by her ministers. It does not appear, however, from a careful examination of the laws of the first Christian emperors that this demand was ever conceded in its entirety. The tribunals of the State in this early period of Church history reserved to themselves the cognizance of the graver offences against social order committed by ordained ministers of the Church. Nevertheless, this demand on the part of the Church was continually renewed, and continually gaining ground, in spite of some resistance made by the Frank kings and emperors, who instituted (the institution was transplanted into England) a mixed clerical and lay tribunal for this peculiar class of offenders; and in the eighth century the *clericus* was in most Christian States altogether exempted from the jurisdiction of the civil tribunal, and subjected exclusively to that of his Ordinary, a title which comprehended both the bishop and the officers to whom he delegated his authority.

This *privilegium* of the clergy was rendered to a great extent reasonable (and this plea was expressly set forth by the forged Decretals) by the mode of judicial investigation adopted in those barbarous times; the appeal to the *wager of battle*, as a mode of deciding the issue between the litigant parties, was an ordeal to which it was obviously impossible that clerks in holy orders could be subjected. The abuses which this entire exemption of a large and powerful class of subjects from the operation of the criminal law of the State generated during the progress of the Middle Ages, the state of chronic disorder, conflict, and rebellion which it fostered in every community,

and the almost simultaneous abolition of it in every European kingdom, are among the portions of history which are most familiar to the ordinary reader.

The abolition of this privilege, equally pernicious to the clergy and the laity, was quite consistent with leaving the proper jurisdiction of the Ordinary to flow, as in early times, within its natural and legitimate boundaries. But this position, once so simple in reality, and capable of being so simply stated, soon became practically, and has continued to be, one of considerable complication and grave embarrassment.

The Church of the Catacombs, and even the Church of Constantine and Justinian, stood in very different relations with the State from those which subsisted between these two powers in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. The change in these relations was a necessary consequence of the constant growth and intertwining of civil interests with the *status* of a large and opulent ecclesiastical corporation.

A spiritual society dependent on voluntary and precarious contributions from the faithful, and a spiritual society endowed and established, and dependent on the civil law of the State for the security of its possessions, were socially and in their bearing upon the temporal government very different institutions. The change affected those within and those without the institution; the clergy as well as the laity. The beneficed clerk was a citizen; the layman was perhaps his relative or his patron. The service of the altar had become a means of temporal support and livelihood which the layman destined one or more of his children to attain, and to which his ancestor had contributed by endowments. The law which governed the clergyman, by the authority of which he was suspended from or deprived of his benefice, became indirectly a matter of interest to the layman; while, on the other hand, the clergyman might sometimes feel a not unnatural desire to appeal from the decision of his Ordinary, which, in the case of deprivation or deposition, reduced him to beggary, to the justice administered by the Crown through the courts in which his fellow-citizens were tried. This feeling would, of course, be much stronger in the case where the Ordinary happened to be a foreigner, and where the ultimate appeal from him lay to a foreign and distant tribunal.

The Crown might, consistently with due respect for the ecclesiastical *status* and law, and with a refusal to adjudicate on the *merits* of an ecclesiastical case, determine nevertheless that justice should be done, and order a new or fuller trial to be had in cases where the clerk complained that justice had not, owing to a defect in the mode of procedure, or some other cause, been done to him.

It is not our purpose to trace the outward development and practical expression of these feelings in the constitutional usages and written laws of the Continental States. Many of our readers will have some knowledge of the struggles between the kingly and papal authorities upon these questions, and especially of the *appellatio ab abuso* allowed by canonists to the Crown; more familiarly known by the practice of France, because the Gallican Church, including clergy and laity, once at least carefully vindicated a claim to the *appel d'abus* as one of its essential privileges and protections against the encroachments of Rome. We purpose to confine ourselves in the remarks which follow, to the operation of these causes upon the question of the Discipline of the Clergy in England.

In England the discipline of the clergy does not appear until a comparatively late period to have excited the jealousy of the laity, or the interference of the civil tribunals. The history of the causes of this jealousy and interference is very instructive, and necessary to be studied by those who would arrive at a just solution of a very difficult problem. During the later period of our Anglo-Saxon history, the bishop and the sheriffs sat together on the bench of the court of the county, and occasionally an ecclesiastical officer exercised judicial functions in the court of the hundred.

The Conquest introduced a change in this respect, remarkable, in the first instance, but of unforeseen moment in its consequences. William granted, as a boon to his Norman clergy, the memorable charter which severed the ecclesiastical and lay jurisdictions, and the effect of which is expressed in the noble language of an early statute of Henry the Eighth, to which attention will presently be drawn. But in the long interval between the reigns of the Conqueror and the eighth Harry, the temporal condition of the Church had undergone an enormous change. The patron who founded, or succeeded to the founder of the benefice, had begun to claim his rights, as well as the clerk who through his presentation obtained institution to and induction into it from the Ordinary. It had begun to be felt that the deprivation of the clerk might indirectly injure, or at least affect, the patron.

But before the full and continually increasing effect of this consequence of endowment be dwelt upon, we must notice a statute passed during the reign of Henry the Seventh. This statute is remarkable on various grounds.¹ It indicates that the spiritual governors of the Church had for the first time found the necessity of applying to Parliament to strengthen their

¹ 1 Hen. VII. c. 4.

hands in enforcing the temporal punishment consequent on the spiritual censure. It is very doubtful whether the provisions of this statute were ever put in ure, and to this circumstance may probably be due the very surprising historical and constitutional fact that the statute continued in force and unrepealed till the reign of her present Majesty.

When the privilege of entire exemption of the clergy in all cases from the jurisdiction of the usual civil tribunals, whether through desuetude or by express law, ceased to exist, the State nevertheless recognised a distinction between offences against the municipal, and offences against the ecclesiastical law, and allowed the latter to be reserved for the cognizance of the tribunals of the Church. It therefore necessarily happened, that in some cases the character of the offence, so to speak, determined the tribunal before which the offender should be tried.

It is obvious, however, that this line of demarcation between the temporal and spiritual tribunals could not in practice be always so sharply drawn as to give exclusive jurisdiction to either. The State might take cognizance of a certain class only of moral crimes, but all moral crimes must be offences against spiritual law. The municipal law, for instance, which punished rape, might leave fornication untouched; but the spiritual law must look upon the former as including, in an aggravated form, the latter crime, and could not abstain from punishing the criminous clerk, because he had also subjected himself to temporal punishment. It might happen, moreover, that the circumstances of the case might render it doubtful, in the first instance at least, which class of crime had been committed.

The *scandal* to the Church required instant *purgation*. Was she not to proceed against her accused minister because, in the course of the judicial investigation, it might turn out that a temporal as well as a spiritual offence had been committed by him? Again, the accused might escape by the aid of some technical flaw the punishment of the temporal law, especially where that law threw every protection which the spirit of mercy and the love of liberty could suggest, around the criminal; but there might be ample evidence to convict him of such scandalous and immoral conduct as to render it imperative upon the Church to eject him from her ministry. Was she to be precluded from doing so because he had been tried and acquitted, howsoever, by the temporal court of the greater offence? The solution of this difficulty has been variously attempted by the laws of various States. It is a satisfactory feature of the English law, that it has always,¹ as

¹ *Burder v. Hodgson*, 4 Notes of Cases, § 487. *Bishop of London v. Bonwell*. 1861.

recently illustrated by the judgment of the Judicial Committee in the case of Mr. Bonwell, recognised the authority of the Church courts to purge the Church of a *scandal*, whether the offence causing the scandal has or has not been cognizable *per se* by those courts.

At the time when the appellate jurisdiction from the Ecclesiastical and Admiralty Courts was transferred to this new tribunal, that part of the jurisdiction which related to the discipline of the clergy does not appear to have, and indeed, we know from a subsequent declaration of Lord Brougham, had not, attracted the attention either of the Legislature or of the Church. Not only did the testamentary and matrimonial jurisdiction form so much the principal part of the business of these courts as to overshadow and almost conceal their jurisdiction over the clergy, but the cases in which this jurisdiction had been exercised were so rare and far between, that it had taken no hold of the public mind. Certainly if the Church and the Government had been wisely advised, the opportunity would have been seized to have reformed and put on a better basis the whole matter of ecclesiastical discipline. However, there was no Cranmer, Stillingfleet, Gibson, or Horsley on the episcopal bench, nor had the mantle of ecclesiastical erudition and knowledge of jurisprudence fallen upon any of the existing governors of the Church; there was no immediate practical pressing grievance on the subject, without the spur of which the English Government or Legislature can rarely be induced to propose and forward any improvement in an existing state of things; though under the influence of that spur they so often act with immature knowledge and a very imperfect foresight of the consequences of the measure which popular clamour compels them to concede.

The state of the law respecting the discipline of the clergy at the beginning of her present Majesty's reign, may be briefly stated as follows:—

A criminal suit against an accused clerk might have been instituted in any consistorial court, but not only in them, but in any archidiaconal court, or court of exempt jurisdiction, to which by ancient papal grant had been committed episcopal jurisdiction.

The appeal from the consistorial court lay to the court of the Archbishop of the province, and from thence to the king in Chancery; that is, to a court of delegates nominated by the Crown under the advice of the Lord Chancellor.¹

The charge or indictment was set forth, as it is now, in

¹ 24 Henry VIII. c. 12; 25 Henry VIII. c. 19.

articles or positions, according to the form of the civil and canon law. The evils attendant on this mode of trial were partly accidental, partly inherent in the system itself. The former, however, presented the most serious obstacle to the due administration of justice.

The Consistory of the Bishop was presided over by a Chancellor, who united in himself the functions of Vicar-General and Official Principal. These offices have, it is believed, never been severed since the Reformation. In recent statutes the term Chancellor is generally used, but in the Clergy Discipline Act the term Vicar-General occurs. This officer was presumed to be, and ought to have been, according to the law of the Church, if not according to the law of the land, a person well skilled in the jurisprudence which he had to administer. Such has always been the Chancellor of London; but unfortunately, the Bishops of other dioceses had, in many cases, considered the office of chancellor as a piece of patronage, to which any person who had taken the degree of Master of Arts might be preferred. The consequence was, that when a serious case affecting the character and position of a clergyman required investigation, the unfitness of the tribunal was painfully obvious, not only to the accused, but to the judge himself. The only remedy was to send the case by letters of request to be tried in the first instance by the judge of the provincial or archiepiscopal court,—a remedy which weakened, indeed practically to a great extent abrogated, the direct authority of the Bishop over his clergy.

But there were other evils inherent in the system itself; the extreme tardiness and cumbrousness of the forms of procedure, the long depositions taken down in writing, the consequent heavy expense, the delay arising from the variety of tribunals (for we have in the foregoing remarks spoken only of the consistorial court), conspired to render the punishment of a delinquent clerk an achievement of great cost and difficulty, and to furnish a large amount of practical impunity to all but very gross and scandalous criminals. This undesirable state of things was further promoted by a general laxity of religious and moral tone, in some degree also by the interposition of the secular courts by writ of prohibition,¹ and by a generally diffused feeling—it could hardly be called a positive conviction—

¹ Latterly this sometimes happened from the fact that the temporal court decided without hearing civilians, upon the principles and precedents which had warranted the sentence of the ecclesiastical judges. Much depended on the stock of general and ecclesiastical jurisprudence possessed by the chief of the temporal court. Lord Campbell granted much fewer petitions than his predecessor, Lord Denman.

that the *freehold* was the principal, and the *cure of souls* the secondary element in the *benefice* of a clerk in holy orders.

In the year 1840 an attempt was made to remedy this disorder in the Church. It resulted in the passing of the present Clergy (inaccurately termed 'Church') Discipline Act, *the Third and Fourth of Victoria, chapter eighty-six*.

The Act had a very stormy passage through Parliament. The late Bishop of London and the Bishop of Exeter differed widely from each other as to the principle upon which such a measure should be founded. The former was eager for a reform which would expedite and cheapen the trial of criminous clerks, and characteristically intolerant of any obstacle which was interposed between him and the attainment of an object of the excellence of which he was convinced.¹ This prelate, so admirable as a preacher and a speaker, so full of energy and earnestness, nevertheless was a dangerous pilot in a troubled sea; he looked but little ahead—saw no rocks, he knew no shoals; he was, in fact, but ill-versed in the principles of canonical jurisprudence. The latter was of far riper knowledge on this point, and was anxious, above all things, to maintain the personal authority of the Bishop over his clergy.

The result was a compromise, and the Act bore upon its face some of the marks which are often, though not always justly, said to be stamped upon offspring of this description.

The principal alterations introduced by this statute into the law of clergy discipline were,—

1. Every criminal suit might be primarily instituted in the court of the Archbishop of the province, if letters of request to that court are sent by the Bishop of the diocese in which the accused clerk holds preferment, or if the clerk be unbeneficed, by the Bishop of the diocese in which the offence has been committed. If the Bishop refuse to send these letters of request, then the criminal suit must be founded upon a previous commission issued by the Bishop to five persons, one of whom must be his vicar-general, archdeacon, or rural dean.

The duty of the Commission is to report, 'whether there be or be not sufficient *prima facie* ground for further proceedings.'

2. If they report that there is sufficient ground, the accused clerk may consent to a lawful sentence being pronounced upon him by the Bishop.

This latter provision is in theory, and has been found in practice to be most beneficial to the Church,—it is the most valuable clause in the whole statute. But if the accused clerk,

¹ *Parliamentary Debates*, Third Series, Vols. xxxiv., xxxv. (1836), pp. 998, 1167; vol. xxxv. p. 6.

from whatever motive, good or bad, decline so to consent, the former provision, with respect to the issue of the commission, becomes, as ought to have been foreseen, the fruitful source of confusion, delay, expense, and injustice. In the first place, the *preliminary* inquiry soon became—as was certain to be the case—practically a regular trial; sworn witnesses examined on both sides, advocates heard, judgment given, and yet, technically, it was not a trial, but a sort of bad, irrational, and imperfect copy of proceedings before a grand jury, the usefulness of which, even in its own sphere, is by no means unquestionable.

In the second place, the witnesses were examined *viva voce*, though at the time when the Act passed into law, the appellate court could only proceed by way of written depositions; so that the evidence had not only to be taken twice over, but in two different ways, the inferior being used at the real trial, and the superior at the preliminary inquiry. This flagrant anomaly has, indeed, since been remedied by a recent statute, which Dr. Phillimore brought into the House of Commons, and Lord Brougham into the House of Lords. This statute introduced for the first time oral evidence into the Ecclesiastical courts.

The practical effect of this statute has been to assimilate the procedure of the ecclesiastical to that of the temporal court; and, as the former tribunal has comparatively few cases brought before it, to decide them with greater rapidity than the former. Still, great mischief ensues from this *preliminary inquiry*; the depositions taken by the commissioners are to be filed in the registry of the diocese, but they are not to be used as evidence if the cause proceeds—in this case witnesses must be examined *de novo*, and the accused clerk, if he be guilty, is apprised of the evidence which presses most heavily against him, and, if he be unscrupulous, endeavours, of course, to get rid of that evidence before the real trial comes on. In truth, the preliminary inquiry *per se* is in every way objectionable and mischievous; the indirect advantage, which has been referred to, of allowing the accused to confess, and the Bishop to pass sentence without further trial, has no necessary connexion with this preliminary inquiry, and might easily, if that were abandoned, be retained.

3. We have now to consider the next step after the inquiry; and here we find a material, and, in spite of deficient and careless provisions, loosely and uncertainly expressed, a beneficial change in the law. The Bishop may either proceed to try the accused clerk himself, with three assessors, two of whom must be a lawyer of a certain standing, the dean of the cathedral, or an archdeacon, or a chancellor of the diocese, not a lawyer.

Where the chancellor is legally qualified, he would, of course, be the principal assessor, or the Bishop may then, as he might before the inquiry, send the case to the court of the province. In only one instance has the former course been adopted, however, and then under the pressure of a *mandamus*, namely, in the case of the Archdeacon of Taunton; and though that be a most unfortunate precedent, it nevertheless established what had been previously doubted, the power of the Bishop, even under the imperfect machinery of the statute, to sit in person with assessors and try causes of correction of clerks.

4. Another change in the law, concerning the advantage of which very different opinions prevail, was effected by a clause, which provided that after the lapse of two years no clerk should be prosecuted for an offence committed before the beginning of that period.

By the former law, and by the canon law generally, no such limitation is prescribed, though the length of time would, upon general principles, have been considered favourably to the criminal.

The precise limitation is open to many and grave objections; but having once been embodied in a statute, it will not easily be abandoned in any future measure. We are inclined to think that if a discretion had been left to the Ordinary, whether after the lapse of two years he would allow a prosecution to be instituted, perhaps the law would have been better adapted to the peculiar exigencies of the case, and that mercy to the individual, and justice to the Church, would have been better reconciled.

5. With respect to the important question of the Appellate Court, the statute made an alteration, which, in our opinion, however well intentioned, was conceived with little wisdom or foresight, and has been, under the semblance of a boon, an injury to the Church. This subject will presently be more fully discussed.

It ought to be noticed here, that the earlier statute of 1 and 2 Victoria, c. 106, is, in some sense, also a Clergy Discipline Act, because, though professing to be an Act 'to abridge the holding of benefices in plurality, and to make better provision for the residence of the clergy,' and though known by the popular title of 'the Curates Act,' it provides (sec. 31) for the suspension and deprivation of spiritual persons illegally trading; and by sections 32 and 114, for the infliction of severe pecuniary penalties on non-resident Incumbents; and (sections 54—58) for the sequestration of benefices, and, in the last resort, for the deprivation of the beneficed clerk. It is one of many proofs of the slovenly character of ecclesiastical statutes, that

the framers of the 3d and 4th Victoria, c. 86, appear to have forgotten, or to have been ignorant of, the existence of the above-mentioned provisions in the 1 and 2 Victoria, c. 106. Accordingly, a case was ordered in three different courts before it was determined that the provisions of this statute were not by *necessary implication* repealed by those of the 3d and 4th Victoria, c. 86.¹ The loose and doubtful language of this statute has induced, perhaps rendered necessary, several lawsuits for its explication, and has recently raised the very curious and very important question as to the right of the curate, like any other *clericus*, to appeal in the last resort to the Crown,² from an act of his Diocesan depriving him of his *sustentatio* and injuring his character.

The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council have decided that no such right of appeal is given by the statute of 1 and 2 Victoria, c. 106.

Nevertheless, it is manifest that a *civil* statute ought not to be made the instrument of *criminal* punishment; and the clauses in the 1 and 2 Victoria, c. 106, which have this effect, ought, in any future reform of the law, to be included in the penal statute.

To return, however, to the consideration of the 3d and 4th Victoria, c. 86. Probably no statute, except the famous Statute of Frauds, has ever been the subject of so much litigation³ in so short a period. The meaning of its most important provisions has at last been settled, at the cost, indeed, of much labour, delay, and expense, by the judgments of various tribunals, ecclesiastical as well as civil.

The meaning of these provisions, however, has at last been settled; and settled, on the whole, in a manner and sense conducive to the ends of justice and to the maintenance of discipline over the clergy.

These are points which should be well considered by those who desire fresh legislation on the subject. It may be that they are not aware how much of primitive and Catholic discipline has been gained, and how much may be lost. Perhaps the most important illustration of this observation is furnished by the recent decision of the Queen's Bench, in the case of Mr. Golightly against the Bishop of Chichester.

¹ *Bluck v. Rackham*, 1 Robertson, 367; 5 Moore's Privy Council Report, 305.

² *Poole v. The Bishop of London*, before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. 1861.

³ See particularly, *Homer v. Bloomer and Jones*, IX. Jurist, 167. *Head v. Sanders*, 4 Moore's Privy Council Cases. *Bishop of Hereford v. Thompson*, 2 Robertson, 595. *Ditcher v. Denison*, and *Denison v. Ditcher*, before the Archbishop at Bath, in the Queen's Bench, in the Court of Arches, in the Privy Council.

Mr. Golightly contended that anybody in or out of the diocese might compel the Diocesan to allow *his office to be promoted*; that is, in plain language, to allow a criminal suit to be instituted against a clergyman charged with holding heretical doctrines. That the Bishop had no discretion to exercise in the matter—that he had no right to say, ‘I will not allow the peace of my diocese to be disturbed by every foolish fanatic in the kingdom. I am of opinion that evil and not good would result to my diocese in particular, and to the Church at large, from allowing this suit to proceed. The *cura curarum animarum* is committed to me, not to you; I have the responsibility, and corresponding authority.’

The Queen’s Bench, however, fully approved of this reasoning, refused the writ of *mandamus* applied for by Mr. Golightly, and condemned him in the costs of his experiment. This decision was given upon the construction of certain words in the statute, as well as upon the general ecclesiastical law. The true importance of it can only be estimated by those who knew how much doubt, strange indeed to say, previously existed upon the point; and that Dr. Lushington, in the case of *Ditcher v. Denison*, had arrived at a directly opposite conclusion. The last mentioned case was so fruitful in litigation, that it led to a final construction upon the most important clauses of the statute.

It is only necessary to mention here that, in the course of the proceedings in this case, it was fully established that every Bishop is now, at least, empowered and enabled to try himself, in the first instance, every accused clerk in his own diocese; a power which, though theoretically maintained through the agency of their consistorial courts, had practically been lost to them, except as to sentences of deprivation, since the Reformation. It is reported that Lord Stowell, when Chancellor of the Diocese of London, an office on which his abilities and attainments shed great lustre, said one day to a person talking to him on the restraint practically imposed on Bishops by their own consistories, ‘We have got them out, and let us keep them out.’ Yet Lord Stowell was deemed the model of a lay-churchman of his time; nor is there any doubt that, if in his day the questions of doctrine, discipline, and ritual of the Church had been agitated as they have been of late years, he would have brought to the treatment of these subjects the same stores of erudition and jurisprudence, the same faculty of acute and wise application, the same beautiful robe of perspicuous language, which have immortalized his judgments on the law of marriage and of nations. Probably the remark of this great judge was prompted by a conviction of the inability of a

Bishop sitting alone, and unaided, to administer justice in complicated cases of fact, and requiring a full knowledge of the peculiar laws of evidence, and did not apply to the scheme of the present statute, which provides that the Bishop should sit aided by competent assessors. It is, therefore, a very grave question whether at the present moment any attempt should be made to effect a further reformation of the law relating to the discipline of the clergy, even though it be conceded that upon several points a reform be desirable.

Convocation, let Churchmen remember, is still practically weak, not only in its actual power, but in its moral influence; any measure of the kind must pass through Parliament. Is it probable that any measure recognising the fair and just claims of the Church will pass through that ordeal and become a statute? Are the Bishops agreed among themselves in the Lords? What sop is to be given to the Cerberus of Exeter Hall? He knows little of the existing state of Parliament, and, alas! of politics, who is ignorant that no measure recognising the authority of Catholic antiquity will pass the Commons without receiving in its passage a strong infusion of the most acrid and illiberal Puritanism.

What became of the Colonial Church Bill? Where is the Bill for removing the disgraceful and most illiberal restrictions which fetter and stigmatize the Scotch Episcopalian Clergy in England? What made the Scotch Presbyterian members commit the gross inconsistency of voting with the English radicals against church-rates in England, while practically they were maintaining in Scotland the same impost in a manner which would not, *upon their own principles*, bear half an hour's examination and argument? Think of the fitness of a Committee upon a question of Clergy Discipline, composed, *inter alios*, of Messrs. Bright, Kinnaird, Maguire, and Rothschild, even with the addition of Mr. Horsfall? Let, we say, sober-minded Churchmen, clergy and laity, reflect upon the actual existing state of things before they urge the introduction of another act of parliament affecting the vital interests of the Church. Surely, if ever lessons were written for our learning, they are written in the history of recent Parliamentary legislation for the Church. It is a chapter upon which much might be usefully written. Those who have penetrated beneath the surface of things, those who have read and thought on the subject, know how much of her troubles the Church owes to the haste, ignorance, and good intentions of those who sought to cut, by the aid of Parliament, the knot which they had not patience, learning, or wisdom, to untie.

Little did these worthy and well-intentioned persons dream

that the principle they were unwittingly introducing into a statute would derange the most valuable parts of the jurisprudence which remained. How often, when this unexpected result appeared from the decision founded on the statute of a court of law, have we heard the cry, 'We never intended this!'

We have thought it our duty to offer these admonitory words to our readers; but we cannot close this review without some observations both as to the principle upon which any further reformation of the discipline of the clergy should be proposed, and without glancing—we have not space for more—at some of the principal features which ought to characterise any new measure.

As to the first, our readers will perhaps have anticipated our opinion. The only safe principle upon which ecclesiastical or civil reform can be founded is, that an examination should be made into the original character of the institution, especially with the object of ascertaining whether at one time the ends of it were fulfilled, and whether it be practicable at all, and how far, to revert to that system which once worked well, but which has, during the change and chances of its existence, become inefficient. If by removing the rust and impediments, the growth of causes foreign to the institution itself, that institution can be restored, make the attempt; and—most emphatically in matters relating to the Church—avoid experiments and believe experience. Since 1830, at least, we have learnt the consequences of reforming on a theory alien to the character of the institution to be reformed. You make a new institution, and are surprised to find that it lacks the unperceived but real advantages, the silent harmony of action, so to speak, with the rest of the system, which, till you lost them, you did not recognise in the old machine.

Let us proceed to apply these general remarks on the principle of future reform, and to unite them with some notice of the leading features which ought to characterize it.

The Church has within itself a machinery in harmony equally with the Reformation and Antiquity, capable, if properly repaired, animated, and restored, of discharging satisfactorily and expeditiously, the duty of enforcing this discipline of the clergy. There is by the law of England, incident to every Bishop, a Consistory. It is competent to every Bishop to make that Consistory, if it be not so already, the effectual means of aiding him in this arduous matter of the discipline of his diocese. By the recent statute,¹ this court has the power

¹ 17 & 18 Victoria, c. 47.

of hearing causes *vivâ voce*, and of proceeding, as it has recently done in several instances, with the same expedition as any ordinary magistrate. Here is an institution in accordance with the general law of the Church, requiring only to be purged of its abuses, and to be properly put in motion. The president of this court ought to be a good lawyer and a good Churchman. If, with his aid and assessorship, the Bishop tried, as he may now do, in person, the more arduous and important cases, delegating to his chancellor the investigation of the class of cases of which a Bishop might naturally desire to dis-embarrass himself, good order might be obtained now without the danger and uncertainty of a measure the fruit of parliamentary interference.

We must now approach the much vexed question of the means by which the expenses connected with the discipline of the clergy are, whether under the present or under new tribunals, to be defrayed. This question divides itself into two branches. First, the question of the costs incident to the suit; and, secondly, the question of the expenses incident to the maintenance of the tribunal. This subject is one which appears to press most forcibly upon the minds of some men; and without conceding to it the place of importance so ascribed to it, we fully admit that it deserves, upon both points, serious consideration.

First, *as to the costs of the suit*.—At present, if the Bishop or the promoter of his office succeed in the suit, and the defendant be punished by *suspension ab officio et beneficio*, the costs can be recovered by sequestration of the living; but if the defendant be punished by *deprivation*, or if he have no benefice, no costs can be recovered, unless the defendant happen to possess a private fortune. It is sometimes said that the English Bishop is so well paid that he may well afford to pay the costs of such occasional suits, and that their large incomes are awarded to them in order to leave a margin for such contingencies. We do not deny that the English Bishops are liberally endowed; but we doubt whether any dispassionate inquirer who duly considers the social position which they necessarily occupy, the many and increasing loud demands upon their charity, the absence of any fund to repair the inevitable dilapidations of the palaces attached to their sees, and the usual expenses of a family, would be of opinion that the costs of such occasional suits ought to be superadded. Nor is it desirable that the consideration of increasing private expense should influence or tempt the Ordinary in the discharge of his duty to the Church; and what duty more imperative than the prosecution of a delinquent clerk? But

from what source can a fund be derived applicable to this purpose? Certainly not from the public treasury. It appears to us that there are but two available sources; one from the sequestration of the living itself, in cases of deprivation, leaving, according to the existing law in cases of *suspension*, provision for the maintenance of a curate. The patron would have no solid ground of objection to this law, because, in the first place, he has partly caused the necessity himself by the presentation of an unfit clerk; and in the second place, his right of presentation again accrues to him, which it might never have done but for the removal of the clerk. Nevertheless, this proposal would probably be opposed by lay-patrons.

The parishioners would certainly be without the advantage incident to the expenditure among them of a larger income by their pastor; but they would be relieved from the ministrations of polluted hands, and the cure of their souls—an evil which can scarcely be overstated—would not be committed to a wicked priest. This last mentioned source does not, it will be observed, supply funds for the punishment of a delinquent but unbeneficed clerk, whom it may be necessary to degrade or depose from his ministry. The other source from which costs might be obtained, is from the funds of the Church herself, now in the hands of the anomalous and costly corporation called the Board of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners.

The consideration of the propriety of laying the burden of the costs of these suits upon this board, is connected in principle with the second part of this subject, namely, *the expenses of maintaining the necessary tribunal*. The remuneration of the chancellor and registrar of the Bishop's court is at present entirely derived from fees, since the abolition of the Testamentary jurisdiction, upon licences and other ecclesiastical instruments, and from fees paid by parishes at triennial visitations. This source of emolument is bad and uncertain—a proper substitute for it would be a boon to the clergy, the laity, and the ecclesiastical officers themselves; that substitute ought not, however, any more than in the case of the costs of a prosecution, to come from payments made (unless temporarily) by the State, but from the proper revenues of the Church. The haste, fear, and superficial acquaintance with the system and needs of the Church, which characterised the early history of the Ecclesiastical Commission, are in no particular more evident than in the entire omission to make any provision out of the suppressed revenues of cathedrals for the maintenance of the discipline of the clergy. Yet the means of attaining this object, of primary importance to the Church, was a most legitimate charge upon

her proper revenues. In some places, it may be observed, the chancellor of the diocese has *stallum in choro* by the statutes of the Cathedral. If the offices of chancellor and registrar be intrinsically useless, incapable of being improved or turned to good account, let them be abolished; but if they are the contrary, why should another tribunal be established? But whatever be the tribunal the cost of it must fall upon the Church. It might be no inequitable or unwise arrangement if the State were to lend funds to the Church for this object, taking security for repayment from the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, whose revenues must ultimately, and at no very distant period, be ample for this object. But eventually the Church must, in the temper of the present times, and in our opinion ought, to furnish the means of defraying the expenses incident to the maintenance of her own discipline. Indeed, this claim upon the ecclesiastical revenues has been very recently recognised by the Legislature in the case of Ireland, the Irish Ecclesiastical Commissioners having been empowered to pay the chancellor and registrar of combined dioceses.

In the meanwhile, one of our most interesting colonies, in which Church principles have struck their roots deep, is herself occupied with the consideration of the subject of this review. New Zealand has prepared "a Bill for establishing Diocesan Courts, and Courts of Appeal for the branch of the United Church of England and Ireland in New Zealand," which we have now before us.

This bill is indeed little more than terms of agreement, a kind of concordat between the clergy and laity of the Church in the colony, as to the mode in which the discipline of the Church shall be exercised, as at present this agreement cannot be clothed with the character of a statute sanctioned by the State.

It is, however, very instructive to us in Old England to observe what measures a church of Englishmen in a new country, unfettered by acts of parliament, judicial decisions, or precedents, wishes to adopt for the purpose of enforcing spiritual discipline. We have thought the whole paper in this view so interesting, that we have appended it as a note to this article. It will be seen that it provides for a legal Chancellor of the Diocese, a legal Advocate of the Diocese, and a kind of jury, four, two clergymen and two laymen, who are to be assessors to the chancellor, and are to be unanimous in their verdict on the facts before sentence can be passed. There is to be one appeal upon points of law and upon points of doctrine or ritual, to the bench of Bishops. The whole question of appeals from the decisions of colonial ordinaries requires careful revision. We are inclined to think that there should be no appeal from the

decision of the Metropolitan of the Colony until the day arrive when there shall be again a general council of united Christendom. This is, however, a subject which would lead us far beyond our present limits. To return to our proper theme, namely, the English court, in which the Bishop, aided according to the suggestions which we have made, presided. We are disposed to think that there would be but few appeals, except upon questions of doctrine or ritual, from an episcopal tribunal so organized and so equipped.

The mention of *appeal* brings us, though not immediately, to the gravest part of our subject. We say not immediately, because the first appeal to the Archbishop and his court might be, and indeed is, conducted in entire accordance with the ancient usage of the Church, with the advantage of oral evidence, now invariably introduced into it. It is the ultimate appeal which primitive usage, no less than English justice, demands, which, from the causes already noticed, constitute the real difficulty of the whole matter.

To us it seems that this difficulty is by no means insuperable, requiring only to be encountered honestly, and on principle, to be overcome, not by any elaborate and intricate machinery, which is certain to fall out of gear, but by the consistent application of the true principles upon which Church and State exercise their authority.

Our first proposition is the removal of the three prelates, Canterbury, York, and London, from the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. We have already stated that in our opinion their presence, or rather, the presence of one of them, which is generally the case, affords no satisfaction to those Churchmen who desiderate an ecclesiastical tribunal, in no way removes or lessens the grievance of the Church, gives no real strength or force to the jurisdiction, while it tends to perpetuate it.

The anomaly of the Bishop of London sitting upon an appeal from the Archbishop of Canterbury or York is manifestly indefensible; the effect of a decision by a single prelate upon points of doctrine or Church discipline, as a member or assessor to a tribunal, is to leave a rankling sense of injustice in the minds of Churchmen, to destroy the respect and reverence due from the priest to his Ordinary, and to assist the progress both of Rome and infidelity in this realm.

But what remedy is there? The following remedy:—Let the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council sit as a lay tribunal—a better one could not be devised. Let them receive *appellationes ab abusu*, and adjudicate upon all questions relating to the construction of statutes, of which the Rubric is a part, and the facts and evidence of a case of discipline. If a question

of doctrine arises in the course of hearing, either mediately, *e.g.*, as connected with the interpretation of the rubrics, or immediately, let them, as they would be eager to do, follow the analogy of all tribunals when questions of foreign law come before them, merely refer the matter to *experts* in that law, submit a case to the Upper House of Convocation, and require the opinion of the Episcopate thereupon, which would by analogy, and practically speaking, be binding upon them as a decision on the point. It would be difficult to suggest a more reasonable proposition, one more in accordance with the spirit of our institutions, one fairer to all parties, one more likely to reconcile the increasing divisions of Church and State, one more likely, as far as mere human institutions can avail, to produce the blessings of unity and peace. The principal outlines of this reform were sketched by Lord Derby in a speech which he delivered in the House of Lords, bearing every mark of the vigour, and none of the defects, of his character. Never did statesman deliver upon a momentous subject, at a time of great agitation, a wiser or an abler speech¹.

It is scarcely necessary to state that the proposition of submitting the clergy to trial in the ordinary law courts is the one which we do not even discuss. Nobody, we are satisfied, who has ever seriously considered the necessary consequences of such a measure, the degradation which would thereby accrue to the whole order of the clergy, the irreverence and disrespect which it would generate in the laity, would advocate a measure at variance with the whole practice and usage of Christendom. Rather let us put in force the spirit as well as the letter of the English constitution. An unintentional breach in it was confessedly made when, *per incuriam*, as Lord Brougham admitted, questions of doctrine were withdrawn from the Delegates, and submitted, with causes of wills and marriage, to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. Nowhere is the true voice of our constitution more wisely or more majestically heard than in the noble language of the twelfth chapter of twenty-fourth statute of Henry VIII., with a citation from which we close these observations on the Discipline of the Clergy.

‘Whereas, by divers sundry old authentic Histories and Chronicles, it is manifestly declared and expressed, that this realm of England is an Empire, and so hath been accepted in the world, governed by one supreme head and King, having the dignity and royal estate of the imperial crown of the same: unto whom a body politick, compact of all sorts and degrees of people, divided in terms, and by names of Spirituality and Temporality been bounden and owing to fear, next to God, a natural and humble obedience. . . . The body

¹ *Parliamentary Debates* (Third Series), vol. cviii. p. 381, 1889 (1850); vol. iii. p. 648 (1850).

spiritual whereof having power when any cause of the Law Divine happened to come in question, or of spiritual learning, then it was declared, interpreted, and showed by that part of the said body politick, called the Spirituality, now being usually called the English Church, which always hath been reputed, and also found of that sort, that both for knowledge, integrity, and sufficiency of number, it hath been always thought, and is at this hour sufficient and meet of itself, without the intermeddling of any exterior person or persons to declare and determine all such doubts, and to administer all such offices and duties as to their rooms spiritual doth appertain . . . and the Law Temporal . . . was and yet is administered, adjudged, and executed by sundry judges and ministers of the other part of the said body politick, called the Temporality: *and both their jurisdictions do conjoin together to the due administration of justice, the one to help the other.*

[NOTE.]

THE NEW ZEALAND ECCLESIASTICAL COURTS BILL.

A BILL for establishing Diocesan Courts and Courts of Appeal for the Branch of the United Church of England and Ireland in New Zealand.

WHEREAS it is necessary that Courts be instituted in New Zealand, through which the Bishops of the Church may exercise the authority vested in them for the maintenance of sound Doctrine and Discipline, and also Courts of Appeal from the decision of the said Courts :

Be it therefore Resolved by the Bishops, Clergy, and Laity of the Branch of the United Church of England and Ireland in New Zealand, in General Synod assembled, as follows :

I.—CONSTITUTION OF THE BISHOP'S COURT.

1. There shall be in every Diocese a Court, to be called the Bishop's Court, which shall have and exercise jurisdiction over all persons under the authority of the General Synod, and shall hear and determine all cases in which any Clergyman shall be charged with any of the Offences set forth in the 'Statute of Ecclesiastical Offences, 1862,' and all cases in which any Trustee or Office-bearer of the Church shall be charged with any Breach of Trust or Duty.

2. The Bishop shall from time to time appoint a fit person to preside in the Bishop's Court on the trial of all questions of fact which shall be at issue therein, who shall be called the *Chancellor of the Diocese*, and who shall be removable by the Bishop, upon a Resolution of the Diocesan Synod, but not otherwise.

3. The Bishop shall from time to time appoint a fit person to conduct on behalf of the Church all proceedings which shall be instituted in the said Court, and who shall be called the *Church Advocate of the Diocese*; and also a fit person to be the Registrar of the said Court. The Advocate and the Registrar shall be removable by the Bishop, upon a Resolution of the Diocesan Synod, but not otherwise.

4. The Bishop shall also from time to time appoint, with the concurrence of a majority of both Orders in Diocesan Synod assembled, not less than *five Clergymen and five Laymen*, who shall be called the Assessors of the Bishop's Court, and shall hold their Office for three years. Provided that any such Assessor may resign his Office by letter addressed to the Bishop, or may be

removed for sufficient cause by the Bishop, upon a Resolution of the Diocesan Synod, but not otherwise.

5. Upon the occurrence of any vacancy among such Assessors by death, resignation, or removal, the Bishop shall, with such concurrence as aforesaid, fill up the vacancy forthwith, if the Synod be in Session; or if not, then at the first Session thereafter.

6. Except in cases of Breach of Trust, the said Bishop's Courts shall take cognizance of no accusation which shall not have been preferred within *two* years after the Commission of the Offence complained of.

II.—PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE TRIAL.

7. Any Member of the Church, who shall have signed the Declaration prescribed by the Statute of the General Synod, No. 1, Section 6, having any Charge, cognizable by such Bishop's Court as aforesaid, against any other person under the jurisdiction of the said Courts, shall lay his Charge in writing under his hand before the Advocate of the Diocese in which the accused person shall reside. Such charge shall be in one of the Forms set forth in the Schedule hereunto annexed, or as near thereto as may be.

8. The person preferring the Charge shall also execute a Bond to the Registrar of the Diocese, with two sufficient Sureties to be approved by the said Registrar, in such reasonable Penalty (not exceeding Fifty Pounds) as the said Registrar shall deem sufficient for the security of the person accused, binding the accuser to pay all costs and expenses of such proceedings which he may be ordered by the Chancellor to pay, as hereinafter provided.

9. The Church Advocate shall, within *seven* days after such Charge shall have been laid before him, send a copy of the Charge to the person accused; and, after receiving an answer from him or waiting a reasonable time for such answer, shall select by lot out of the Assessors hereinbefore mentioned, two Clergymen and two Laymen, and shall lay before them the said Charge and the answer thereto (if any) of the person accused. If the said Assessors, or the major part of them, after hearing both parties, or their agents, and their witnesses in closed Court, or after hearing the accuser or his agent and his witnesses, in case the party accused shall refuse to attend, shall decide that no sufficient cause exists for instituting proceedings in the Bishop's Court, the case shall be dismissed. If they shall also pronounce the charge to be frivolous and vexatious, the Chancellor shall, upon the application of the person accused, order his costs, to an amount to be stated in the Order, and not exceeding the Penalty of the said Bond, to be paid by the person by whom the charge was preferred: but if they shall decide that sufficient cause does exist, the Chancellor of the Diocese shall thereupon, upon application made to him by the said Advocate, issue a Citation under his hand requiring the attendance of the accused person before the Bishop's Court, to be holden at such time and place as the Chancellor shall in such Citation appoint. The Chancellor shall also thereupon issue letters to the Assessors aforesaid, summoning them to meet at such time and place. Provided that such Court shall be holden not less than *One* nor more than *Six* Calendar months after the date of such Citation.

10. The Chancellor shall also at the request of either of the parties, issue letters to persons whose evidence may be required at the trial, requesting them to attend at such time and place as aforesaid, and (if necessary) requesting them also to bring with them such books and writings relating to the matters in issue as may be in their possession or power.

11. When any Witness shall be unable to travel by reason of age, sickness, or infirmity, or shall be resident more than fifty miles from the place appointed

for the trial, the Chancellor may at any time after the issue of the Citation, appoint, in such manner and upon such terms as he shall see fit, a Commissary to take the testimony of such witness; and such Witness may be examined, cross-examined, and re-examined by the parties or their agents before such Commissary. The examination shall be reduced into writing and signed by the Witness and the Commissary; and the same shall be forthwith transmitted by him to the Chancellor, and shall without further proof be received in evidence by the Court.

12. Immediately upon the termination of the Preliminary Inquiry before-mentioned, the Advocate of the Diocese shall certify in writing to the Bishop the decision of the Assessors. And in case the said Assessors shall have found sufficient cause to exist for instituting proceedings in the Bishop's Court, it shall be competent for the Bishop to inhibit the person accused from performing the services of the Church or from exercising his office until final judgment shall have been given in the Cause or on Appeal. And in every case, except where the person accused shall be a Trustee of Church Property, it shall be competent for the Bishop to appoint a Substitute to act during the period in which the inhibition shall continue in force.

13. The Charge may at any time, by permission of the Chancellor, be amended in such manner and on such terms as he shall think fit and necessary for the purposes of Justice, provided that the substance of the Charge be not varied by any such amendment.

14. If the accused person shall at any time before the trial, by writing under his hand, confess the truth of the Charge, and consent that the Bishop shall forthwith pronounce Sentence upon him, it shall be competent for the Bishop to pronounce accordingly such Sentence as he shall think fit, not exceeding the Sentence which might have been pronounced if proceedings had gone on in the ordinary course.

III.—PROCEEDINGS AT THE TRIAL.

15. At the time and place fixed for the Trial, the Registrar of the Court shall, in the presence of the Chancellor, proceed to determine by lot the Assessors for the Trial of the cause. Provided that the Defendant shall have the right of challenging peremptorily any two of the Clergymen and any two of the Laymen named by the Registrar at any time before they shall have made the Declaration hereinafter mentioned. But if there be several Defendants they shall not be allowed to sever in their Challenges.

16. If there shall be a deficiency of Assessors, the Chancellor may, with the concurrence of the majority of the Assessors there present and unchallenged, call in the stead of the absent Assessors any Clergymen or Laymen (as the case may be) whom he shall think fit.

17. The first two Clergymen and the first two Laymen who shall remain unchallenged shall act as a Jury on the Trial.

18. Each Assessor shall in open Court, before the commencement of the Trial, solemnly declare, that he will well and truly try the matters in issue in the Cause, and will give a true verdict thereon according to the evidence, without fear, favour, or malice.

19. If the Defendant, having been duly cited, shall fail to appear, either in person or by an Agent, it shall be competent for the Court, if satisfied that his absence is contumacious, to order the Trial to proceed as if he were present.

20. No person shall be allowed to appear as an Agent for the Defendant at the Trial, or as an Agent for either party at the Preliminary Inquiry hereinbefore mentioned, unless he be a Member of the Church who shall have made

and signed the Declaration prescribed by the Statute of the General Synod, No. I. Section 6.

21. Every person who shall be called as a witness, either for or against the defendant, shall, before he give any evidence, make a solemn declaration, that he will speak the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

22. The evidence shall be taken down in writing by the Chancellor. The Chancellor shall admit any evidence which he shall deem to be relevant to the Issue, subject to the Rules following (that is to say):—

a. No Witness shall be allowed to testify as to any of the matters in controversy from information given to him by any other person; but he shall testify only so far as the said matters shall be within his own personal knowledge.

b. Oral evidence shall not be received as to the contents of any document, in any case where the party tendering such evidence can produce the document itself, or cause it to be produced.

c. No copy of any document shall be received in evidence, in any case where the party tendering the same can produce the document itself, or cause it to be produced.

23. The Court shall be open to the public, unless the Chancellor, with the concurrence of the major part of the Assessors, shall deem it expedient to close it, on account of the matter of the inquiry, or misconduct of the audience, or any other urgent reason. In case the Court shall be ordered to be closed, each of the parties may have as many as six male Members of the Church (who shall have signed the Declaration so prescribed as aforesaid), chosen by himself, to form an audience.

24. The Chancellor may from time to time adjourn the Court, as he shall see fit, whether there be any Assessors present or not.

25. The Assessors, after hearing the Church Advocate, and the defendant or his agent, and their witnesses, and after the case shall have been summed up by the Chancellor, shall consider the evidence and deliver their verdict. If the offence charged against the defendant be any of the Offences specified in the first and second Sections of the "Ecclesiastical Offences Act, 1862," the Verdict shall be a Special Verdict, stating in writing the facts of the case as the Assessors find them to have been proved. In other cases, the Verdict may be "guilty," or "not guilty," or a Special Verdict, as they may think fit. Provided always, that no Verdict shall be given in any case without the unanimous consent of the Assessors.

26. In the case of any Verdict being given other than a Verdict of "not guilty," it shall be competent for either party, within *seven* days after the Verdict is given, to apply to the Chancellor for a new trial on the ground that the Verdict is contrary to the evidence; and if the Chancellor shall see sufficient ground for doubting the soundness of the Verdict, he shall grant a new trial. If there have been several matters in issue, the new trial may be confined to one or more of the issues, if the Chancellor shall see fit.

27. The finding of the Assessors upon the new Trial, or, if no new Trial be granted, then the finding of the Assessors upon the original Trial, shall be binding and conclusive upon all parties as to all questions of fact submitted to the Assessors.

28. In every case except where the offence charged shall be a breach of Trust, the Chancellor shall without delay certify to the Bishop the finding of the Assessors, and shall transmit therewith to the Bishop the original charge in writing upon which the defendant was brought to Trial, together with his own notes of the evidence given at the Trial. If the Verdict be other than a Verdict of "not guilty," the Bishop shall thereupon give notice to the defendant and to the Members of the Court of the time and place, when and where he proposes to pass Sentence; and shall permit all other persons, who

may so desire, to be present thereat. Before Sentence is given, the defendant shall have leave to speak in mitigation of punishment. Thereupon the Bishop shall pronounce Sentence according to the Statute of Ecclesiastical Offences, 1862, or such other Statute as shall be in force in that behalf for the time being.

29. It shall be competent for the Bishop, if he shall see fit, to reserve any question of Doctrine or Ritual for the decision of the bench of Bishops, and to reserve any question which may arise as to the interpretation of any Statute of the General Synod, or of any Diocesan Synod, for the decision of the Standing Commission, or of such tribunal as may hereafter be constituted by the General Synod for that purpose, and upon receiving such decision, to give judgment in accordance therewith.

30. In cases where the offence charged shall be a breach of trust, the Chancellor shall without delay certify to the Standing Commission the finding of the Assessors, and shall transmit therewith to the Standing Commission the original charge in writing, upon which the defendant was brought to trial, together with his own notes of the evidence given at the trial. Whereupon the Standing Commission shall proceed as the nature of the case may require.

IV.—APPEAL FROM BISHOP'S COURT.

31. Whenever the sentence pronounced by the Bishop shall have been founded upon a special verdict, it shall be open to either party to appeal therefrom, as to any matter of Doctrine or Ritual, or as to the interpretation of any statute of the General Synod or of any Diocesan Synod. If the ground of Appeal be a question of Doctrine or Ritual, the Appeal shall be to the bench of Bishops, or to such committee of Bishops as the bench may appoint for that purpose. But until such committee shall be formed, it shall be competent for the bench of Bishops to consider and decide such Appeals without meeting together as a Court for that purpose. If it be a question of the interpretation of a statute, the appeal shall be to the Standing Commission, or to such tribunal as may hereafter be constituted as aforesaid.

32. Provided always, that notice of Appeal shall be given to the Bishop and to the opposite party within *seven* clear days after the delivery of the Sentence. Provided also, that no Appeal shall be allowed in any case unless the party prosecuting such Appeal shall have executed a Bond to the Registrar of the Bishop's Court, with two sufficient sureties to be approved by the said Registrar, in such reasonable penalty (not exceeding Fifty Pounds) as the Registrar shall deem sufficient for the security of the other party, that the Appellant will prosecute the Appeal with due diligence, and pay all costs incurred by such other party by reason of the Appeal, which the Appellant shall be adjudged by the Court of Appeal to pay, in case he shall not succeed in his appeal.

33. The Appeal shall be by suing out letters missive from the Bishop to the Court of Appeal, whereunto shall be annexed a transcript (certified by the Registrar) of the charge and of the proceedings thereon, and of the notes of the evidence taken at the trial: and no other evidence shall be brought or received before the Court of Appeal.

34. The Sentence or Judgment pronounced by the Bishop shall not take effect until after the determination of the Appeal.

35. It shall be competent for the Court of Appeal to affirm or to reverse the Sentence or Judgment complained of in the whole or in part, and to make such other Order in the Cause as the said Court of Appeal may deem to be just.

36. Upon the unanimous decision of the Bench of Bishops, or of such Committee of the Bishops as aforesaid, that the Doctrine complained of is directly contrary or repugnant to any of the said *Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion*,

or that the Practice complained of is directly contrary or repugnant to the authorized Practice of the United Church of England and Ireland, the Judgment appealed from shall be confirmed or reversed, as the case may require, or if no Sentence shall have been passed, Sentence shall be passed accordingly. If the Bench, or such Committee as aforesaid, be not unanimously of opinion that such Doctrine or Practice is repugnant as aforesaid, the Judgment shall be for the defendant.

37. In all cases not involving questions of Doctrine or Ritual, judgment shall be given for the appellant, unless a majority of the Members of the Court of Appeal be of opinion that the Judgment pronounced by the Bishop ought to be sustained.

V.—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS.

38. Any Member of the Church who shall have signed the Declaration prescribed by the Statute aforesaid, having a Charge against any Bishop of the Church, may prefer the same in the Diocesan Court of the Metropolitan, or (in case the Charge be against the Metropolitan) in the Diocesan Court of the senior Bishop other than the Metropolitan; seniority being counted from the day of Consecration. The course of proceeding in such cases, and on appeal from the sentence of the Metropolitan or senior Bishop, shall be the same as in ordinary cases, or as near thereto as may be, save only that the Assessors on the Preliminary Inquiry shall be the Metropolitan or such senior Bishop, together with two Clergymen and two Laymen, and also that (if a Trial of any issue of fact shall take place) the Assessors, who shall act as a Jury on the trial of such issue, shall be two Bishops, two Clergymen, and two Laymen.

39. No Clergyman, Trustee, or other Office-bearer, appointed under the authority of the General Synod or of any Diocesan Synod, shall be removed from his office before his term of Office shall have expired, without his own consent, except upon a decision of such Tribunal as is herein constituted; unless it shall have been expressly provided that he may be so removed by the terms of his appointment, or by any Statute of the General Synod.

40. It shall be competent for the Standing Commission from time to time to make all such rules as may be necessary for regulating proceedings in the Courts herein constituted, and to alter or rescind the same. Provided that the same shall not be repugnant to any of the provisions herein contained. All rules so to be made shall be laid before the General Synod at the Session next after the making of the same.

41. In the interpretation of this Statute, the term "Office-bearer" shall include all Clergymen, Trustees, Catechists, Churchwardens, Schoolmasters, and Agents of any kind appointed by or under the authority of the General Synod, or of any Diocesan Synod; the term "Bench of Bishops" shall mean all the Bishops of the Ecclesiastical Province of New Zealand; and the term "Church" shall mean the Branch of the United Church of England and Ireland in New Zealand.

SCHEDULE.

FORM 1.

I, A. B., of _____, a Member of the Branch of the United Church of England and Ireland in New Zealand, do hereby charge and aver that C. D. of _____ being a Minister of _____ did on _____

or about the _____ at _____ in the _____ [*stating particularly and clearly the Offences charged*] contrary to the Provisions of the Statute of Ecclesiastical Offences, 1862: on which Charge I desire that the said C. D. be duly brought to trial. And I solemnly declare that I believe the Charge hereinbefore laid to be substantially true.

A. B.

FORM 2.

I, A. B., of _____ a Member of the Branch of the United Church of England and Ireland in New Zealand, do hereby charge and aver that C. D. of _____ being an Office-bearer of the said Branch of the Church, that is to say, being _____ did on or about _____ at _____ in the _____ [*stating particularly and clearly the Breach of Duty charged*] contrary to the Provisions of the Statute of Ecclesiastical Offences, 1862: on which Charge I desire that the said C. D. be duly brought to trial. And I solemnly declare that I believe the Charge hereinbefore laid to be substantially true.

A. B.

FORM 3.

I, A. B., of _____ a Member of the Branch of the United Church of England and Ireland in New Zealand, do hereby charge and aver that C. D., being a Trustee for and on behalf of the General Synod of certain Lands situate at _____ under and by virtue of a Deed bearing date _____ did on or about the _____ at _____ in the _____ [*stating particularly and clearly the Breach of Trust alleged*] contrary to the Trust expressed and declared in the said Deed: on which Charge I desire that the said _____ be duly brought to trial. And I solemnly declare that I believe the Charge hereinbefore laid to be substantially true.

A. B.

ART. II.—1. *Die Sibyllinischen Weissagungen vollständig gesammelt; nach neuer Handschriften-Vergleichung, mit Kritischem Commentare, und metrischer Deutscher Uebersetzung.* Herausgegeben von DR. T. H. FRIEDLIEB, Professor an der Universität zu Breslau. Leipzig: T. O. Weigel. 1852. 8vo. pp. lxxxv. 232. cxxiv.

2. *Χρησμοὶ Σιβυλλιακοί: Oracula Sibyllina: Textu ad Codices MSS. recognito: Maianis supplementis aucto: cum Castalionis versione innumeris pæne locis emendatâ, et, ubi opus fuit, suppletâ: Commentario perpetuo: Excursibus et Indicibus.* Curante C. ALEXANDRE. Parisiis: Firmin Didot. 8vo. Volumen Primum, 1851, pp. lxviii. 302. Volumen I. Pars II. 1853, pp. xvi. 260. Volumen alterum, 1856, pp. 624. 82.

THE Sibyls! Familiar as is the name to us, how little we realize the place which they occupied in the Christian Mythology of the Mediæval Saints! How difficult to feel that ages which received the Decretals, received also the pseudo-prophecies of Sibyllic composition with unbounded faith—received them, fed on them, built on them! And yet we doubt whether there are many English scholars who have ever read them through, while their sublime poetry is all but unknown to ordinary students. Till lately, the huge compilations in which alone the *χρησμοὶ* were to be procured, rendered such ignorance more excusable. But Dr. Friedlieb's reprint, however grave its faults, at all events made the study of the Sibylline fragments open to all. And now M. Alexandre has produced a work which has fully exhausted the subject. His good taste, his learning, his grasp of his matter, his appreciation of the place which the Sibylline poems held in the centuries before our LORD—in primitive and in mediæval times—render his work the best French edition of a Greek book which it has ever been our lot to see.

We are to regard the Sibylline Oracles as a text-book of Prophecy for early and mediæval times; and as such we proceed to consider them.

Dies iræ, dies illa
Solvat seclum in favillâ
Teste David cum Sibyllâ

It pleased the French Reformers of the Breviary to alter the two last lines after this fashion:—

Crucis expandens vexilla
Solvat seclum in favilla.

But the original reading gives a far better idea of the influence which the Sibylline Oracles exerted over the whole of mediæval lore. To those ages it seemed nothing wonderful if the GOD Who had inspired Balaam to say, 'I shall see Him, but not now; I shall behold Him, but not nigh; there shall come forth a star 'out of Jacob, and a sceptre shall arise out of Israel;' Who had inspired Caiaphas with the declaration, 'It is expedient that one man should die for the people;' that He Who had even put those words into the mouth of Virgil—

Jam redit et Virgo, redeunt Saturnia regna:
Jam nova progenies cœlo demittitur alto:

that He should have vouchsafed to turn the oracles of darkness into the means of propagating the light. And certainly there are indubitable instances in which the devils, as of old time, confessed Him Whom they equally hated and feared. To say nothing of the tale related by Plutarch—which yet there seems no reasonable ground for doubting—how the pilot Tamois, on the very evening of our LORD's Passion, was commanded by an aerial voice to proclaim, near the promontory of Phalacrum, that 'Great Pan is dead;' and instantly the whole surrounding atmosphere was filled with the sounds of wailing and lamentation: there are the irrefragable accounts of the cessation of the oracle of Daphne, when the remains of S. Babylas were there interred; and of the oracle which, silenced by S. Gregory's having passed a night in the temple, could not resume its functions till the evil spirit was formally permitted to reassert his ancient power. Let us now, therefore, give a few quotations from the earliest Fathers, which shall show how widely and how deeply the belief in the Sibylline Oracles had permeated the Church. In the first place, there is that passage in the *Similitudes* of S. Hermas, where there appears to the writer an aged woman, in glorious apparel, who begins to read from a volume. And some time afterwards the angel asks:—"The aged woman from whom thou didst receive this book: whom thinkest thou her to be?" I replied, "The Sibyl." "Wrong," said he; "it is not so." "Who then is she, lord?" said I; and he answered, "It is the Church of God." Then, again, we find S. Justin Martyr over and over again quoting the same testimony, and using the witness of the Prophetess in verification of the truths of the Gospel. S. Theophilus, Bishop of Antioch,

in the time of Commodus, in his Apology for the Christian religion to his friend Autolycus, quotes largely from the Sibyl: and with respect to these early apologists one consideration must strike us with great force. Against whatever they said, it was certain that the whole learning and ingenuity of the heathen world would be taxed to discover a reply. What entire confidence, then, must they have felt in the authenticity of these poems, who thus seem to imperil the being of the Christian religion on such an issue! S. Clement of Alexandria cites no less than forty-six verses from the same poems. Origen, however, seems to have had a truer view of the subject. He does indeed maintain the authenticity of the Sibylline writings against Celsus as a matter of argument; but one cannot but feel him to be arguing against his own convictions, on the principle of not yielding an inch of ground to his adversary. And in confirmation of this belief, we may observe that he never quotes the Sibyl but once, and then merely by way of allusion rather than of argument. The same thing may be said of S. Hippolytus; he never makes an absolute citation from the Oracles, though he twice alludes to them; once, in the fifty-second chapter of his work on Antichrist; the other, in his book on the consummation of the world. At the same time, that the ordinary run of the Greek-speaking Christians during the second and third centuries deeply studied, and were entirely imbued with the spirit of, these oracles, is made certain by the fact, that in the third century so many fresh forgeries of the same kind were published; so that, in fact, the more beautiful, and to a certain extent the more valuable, portion of the existing books are to be referred to that period.

But in the Western Church, where criticism was at a much lower ebb, the Sibylline oracles were quoted without any kind of doubt. Let us hear Tertullian: 'I will speak a little more concerning Saturn, and will not omit those testimonies of Divine literature to which so much faith is due on account of their age. The Sibyl, before literature existed at all, speaks thus concerning the birth and the history of Saturn. In the tenth generation, says she, of men, after the Deluge, reigned Saturn, and Titan, and Japetus,¹ the most mighty children of earth and heaven.' He is quoting that which we now read as the 108th verse of the third book. In like manner in his treatise *De Pallio*, he tells us that the Sibyl spoke true with respect to Delos and Samos, in manifest allusion to Book viii. line 165.

Half a century later, Arnobius, in his treatise against the Gentiles, derides the heathen for affirming it to have been by

¹ *Japetus* is a most easy and certain correction for *Jam fatus*.

the inspiration of Apollo that the Sibyl uttered so much truth. In the same century, but later, that most excellent man, and most barbarous poet, Commodianus, transfers some of the Sibyllic rules into his own uncouth lines.

And next we come to Lactantius, who, of all Latin writers, is the most imbued with the spirit of these Oracles. There are in the works of this writer more than seventy quotations from the Oracles; and these of such length, that from them no inconsiderable portion of the present Sibylline writings might be recovered. And it was probably from the works of Lactantius that the Emperor Constantine, in his oration to the Fathers of Nicæa, quoted the Sibyl; and more especially referred to that most touching passage:—

αἱ, αἱ, ἐγὼ δειλὴ, πότ' ἐλεύσεται ἡμᾶς ἐκείνο,

which one cannot but imagine to have been in the mind of Thomas of Celano, in that pathetic verse of the *Dies Iræ*—

Quid sum miser tunc dicturus?
Quam patronum rogaturus?
Cum vix justus sit securus.

And, as we shall have occasion hereafter to show, Constantine dwells on the celebrated acrostich of the Lord's Name, as one of the most convincing proofs of the Christian religion.

If we proceed in ecclesiastical history, S. Cyril of Jerusalem opposes one Sibylline passage to Julian; but, as it will appear, not taken from the original work, but a second-hand quotation from the report which Eusebius gives of the oration of Constantine to the 'Saints.' In like manner, S. Basil, S. Chrysostom, and S. Epiphanius have no reference whatever to the Sibyl; and if S. Gregory Nazianzen alludes to her, it is rather in his character of poet than of bishop. Sozomen, however, quotes one line from the Oracles regarding the Cross:—

ὁ ξύλον, ὃ μακάριστον, ἐφ' ᾧ Θεὸς ἐξετανώσθη.

And it is singular that at an epoch which was supposed to be sinking into darkness, Procopius passes a juster opinion on these Oracles than most of his predecessors. He says that he cannot attach any importance to their prophecies as prophecies, because they seem to have been written subsequently to the events of which they spoke; but that as works of a certain value in their way, he brings forward their testimony.

It is singular to find, in the fifth century, an Armenian author alluding to our Prophetess. Monsieur Alexandre quotes from the Whistons' edition of Moses Khorensis a passage in which that author speaks of the Sibyl. That edition we have not at hand;

but either he quotes, or the Whistons translated, incorrectly. We give the actual sentence from the edition published at the Mekhitarist press in 1841: 'But at first I am glad that I can begin my account from my dear Berosian Sibyl, who is much truer than the greater part of historians. Before the Tower, and the multiplication of languages in the human race, after the navigation of Xisuthris into Armenia, Zerouan, Titan, and Japheth were princes of the earth. These persons appear to me to be Shem, Ham, and Japheth.'¹

The derivation of the word Sibyl, 'she that hath the counsel of God,' seems next to certain. The number of the prophetesses honoured with that appellation is more doubtful; Varro, who, as cited by Lactantius, was the mediæval authority, mentions these:—1. The Persic; 2. Libyan; 3. Delphian; 4. Cimmerian; 5. Erythræan; 6. Samian; 7. Cumæan; 8. Hellespontic; 9. Phrygian; 10. Tiburtine; and their legends or attributes are usually, in the Cathedrals of the Middle Ages, given as we shall presently notice. Of the lists which we have seen—in stalls, in stained glass, in stone sculpture, in rood-screens, or in the illuminations of the huge choir-books—these cathedrals or minsters supply the best examples:—Ulm, in Würtemberg; Ribe, in Jutland; Marieboe, in the island of Falster; Palencia, in Spain; Chaise-Dieu, in Burgundy; Curzola, in the Adriatic island of that name; and Chartres. But Ulm, on the whole, is the best, and we may as well here repeat the prophecies of each Sibyl as there given. When the reader has acquainted himself with the interest of the productions themselves, he will be the more ready to enter into an inquiry as to their date and authorship. We give the names as there spelt; the work dates 1469—1474.

1. *Sibella Eretria*. She holds the famous acrostich, which, on account of its world-wide reputation, it will be proper hereafter to quote. The Ulm version, admirably carved in an oaken scroll against the south pier of the chancel arch, is that of S. Augustine.

We shall have occasion to enter more at length, by-and-bye,

¹ Բայց ես այժմ ուրախացայց հաւ առնելով առաջիկայիցս իմոց բանից 'ի սիրդն իմմէ և քան զշատս յարդարախօսողէ, 'իբիւռսեանն Սիբիլղեայ. &c.

² Σιδος = θεός· βύλλα or βόλλα = βουλή. No one will now follow the derivation which Pausanias tells us was in fashion at Delphi (Phocæa xii.), that σιβυλλα was a mere metathesis for λίβυσσα.

³ Tacitus says, *Annal.* vi. 12, 'Quod a majoribus quoque decretum erat, post exustum civile bello Capitolium, quæsitis Samo, Illo, Erythris, per Africam etiam ac Siciliam et Italicas colonias, carminibus Sibyllæ (una seu plures fuere) datoque sacerdotibus negotio, quantum humana ope potuissent, vera discernere.' This was in A.D. 82. See Walther, tom. i. 391.

into the subject of this most celebrated acrostich; at present we merely pass on to—

2. The Delphian Sibyl. 'He shall give his back to the strokes, and when he is smitten shall be silent.' (These fragments of prose are not from any of the Sibylline oracles, but from the words of Lactantius, who intends to give their substance.)

3. The Libyan Sibyl. 'He shall take our intolerable yoke on his own neck, and wear it for us.'

4. The Tiburtine Sibyl, called Albuna. 'They shall hang him on a tree, and it shall profit them nothing; for on the third day he shall rise again, and shall show himself to his disciples, and shall be seen by them; he shall ascend into heaven, and of his kingdom there shall be no end.'

5. The Hellespontic Sibyl. (Here we have an attempted translation from the original Greek, and in verse.)

Felix ille Deus ligno qui pendet ab alto.

6. The Cumæan Sibyl, called Amalthea. 'The veil of the Temple shall be rent, and there shall be pitch-black night in the mid-day.'

7. The Cimmerian Sibyl, foretelling to Octavianus that God should be born of a Virgfn. (The line of Virgil.) 'Jam nova progenies cœlo demittitur alto.'

8. The Phrygian Sibyl, called Antico. 'He shall fall into the hands of the unbelievers, and with wicked arms they shall strike the LORD, and shall with impure mouths spit poisonously upon him.'

These eight are all that seem to have been known to the German architect; for there is no reason why, had he been so disposed, he might not have introduced more. At Marieboe there are, or were, eleven, but probably one had been destroyed. At Ribe there are six Sibyls. In a very exquisitely illuminated manuscript Breviary, now preserved in the Royal Library at Copenhagen, there are sixteen; but evidently with the design of matching each prophet—for all the prophets are in like manner thus represented—with a Sibyl. Each of the latter has a legend, consisting of one hexameter verse, proceeding from her mouth, just as each prophet has his clearest prediction of our LORD attached to him the same way. But, in addition, the Sibyls have each, it would seem, their own peculiar attribute; distaff, spade, wheel, plumb-line, and so on, in a way which the present writer is not able to explain.

We now come to the periods at which the several poems at present joined together in one work, as the Sibylline Oracles, were actually written.

And part of that which is now called the third, has un-

doubtedly the claim to the highest antiquity. Only here we must carefully distinguish between the various parts of that book. They are four in number. The first (ver. 1 to 97) seems to have been a later addition. The second, commencing at ver. 97, extends to ver. 294, and contains an account of the various empires of the Egyptians, Persians, Medes, Ethiopians, Assyrians, and Macedonians. Then there appears to be another long insertion, which extends to ver. 489; and then the fourth part of this book begins, and only ends with the book itself. Without entering deeply into their reasons for so determining, it seems certain that the commentators are right in attributing the older part of this book to the time of Ptolemy Philometor: and, in all probability, to the Jew Aristobulus, the preceptor of Euergetes, brother of Philometor, as we learn from 2 Maccabees i. 10. 'In the hundred fourscore and eighth year, the people that were at Jerusalem, and in Judæa, and the Council, and Judas, sent greeting and health unto Aristobulus, king Ptolomeus' master, who was of the stock of the anointed priests, and of the Jews that were in Egypt.' These parts, therefore, of the third book, are entitled to very considerable authority; an authority equal to that of the Maccabees, and superior to that of the apocryphal books of Esdras. On this subject, no critics have written better than Bleek, Gfrörer, and Chausen.

The commencement of the oldest part, consisting of verses 97—294, and 489 to end, very probably intended to imitate the rhapsodical beginnings of the true Sibyls, opens thus:—

But when the threat of God shall be fulfilled,
The threat pronounced on mortals, when they raised
That unblest turret in Assyria's land—
For of one speech were all; and so they willed
The starry heav'n with vain intent to reach:
Wherefore th' Almighty gave His winds command
And forthwith fell the Tower, so huge, so vast,
And in its builders wild contention reign'd:
And Babel is the name men give their work.
But when that tow'r had fall'n, and human speech
Was cleft to various languages, the earth
Was soon replenish'd with divided tribes,
And parted out 'twixt monarchs. Then at last
Rose the tenth race of men, succeeding that
Whelm'd by the Deluge. Then too Cronus reign'd,
Then Titan reign'd, then reign'd Iapetus,
The offspring of the earth and sky—so men
Gave them their title, making earth and sky
Their parents, for that they were greatest far
Of human progeny:—in threefold shares
They measured out the earth, and each had rule
O'er the third part, peace reigning over all.

The writer then goes on to imitate the *Theogony* of Hesiod, twisting it without much ingenuity to Scripture history. After running through a considerable portion of the world's annals, the writer says that there is a race

κατὰ χθονὸς Οὐρ Χαλδαίων
Ἐξ ἧς μοι γένος ἐστὶ

of righteous men, who live holily among the gentiles; and, proceeding to describe the Jews, he predicts terrible punishments on other nations, while they shall be restored to their own land:—

καὶ τότε δὴ ναὸς πάλιν ἔσσεται, ὡς πάρος ἦεν.

Next in time to the Erythræan Sibyl's prophecies, for to her the third book has, from its superior value, been attributed, comes the fourth book, as we have it now; the fourth, in every recension, except the Munich manuscript, where it is called the tenth. But this is evidently the composition of a Christian, and probably of a Christian Jew. The mixture of past history and future prophecy—the wild fragments so natural in a state of excitement such as those of the early persecutions, gives a lively idea of the immediate expectation which the Christians of the first and second centuries entertained of the coming of Antichrist, and the Advent of the Lord. Thus (book iv. line 137) Antioch is to fall under the arms of Italy, led on by Antichrist; Cyprus, by means of an earthquake, is to be overwhelmed in the sea; an inundation of the Meander is to destroy the inhabitants of Caria; and all these things are but the precursors of the final judgment. This book is undoubtedly the most interesting to the ordinary student; and is absolutely necessary to be read by those who would form an idea of the hurried life of excitement in which the most primitive Christians lived,—so different from the calm, quiet repose in the overruling providence of God, which our fancy is apt to attribute to them.

We may observe that our poet was not a millenarian—which, at the time of Titus or Domitian, in which this book was undoubtedly written, is worthy of notice. Let us give a specimen or two of this book.

At verse 157—

Woe! miserable mortals! Dare not thus
The utmost phials of God's fullest wrath!
Lay down the sword: forget the quarrel: leave
The murderous feud unfollowed. Learn to lave
Your bodies in the everlasting stream, and spread
Your supplicating hands to God's high throne,
Beseeching pardon, and with godly deeds
Healing the bitter spring of sin: then God
Shall send His mercy on you, nor destroy
According to your merits: He shall cause

His burning wrath to cease, if only all
 Shall exercise their souls with holy works.
 But if, O hard of heart, ye hear me not,
 But, for ye love transgression, turn away
 To crime and violence, a fire shall rage
 Throughout the world, and this shall be the sign :
 About the hour of sunrise, swords shall blaze,
 And trumpets echo, and the whole wide earth
 Shall hear the mighty uproar and dismay.
 Then the great globe's rotundity shall burn :
 And men and cities perish : and the fire
 Shall lick up streams and sea, and all be dust.
 But when destruction is fulfill'd, God's Hand
 Shall quench the fire it kindled ; and the dust
 And ashes with a human form endue,
 And mortals re-create as first they were.
 Then shall the judgment be ; then God shall sit
 Dooming the world Himself. Who sold themselves
 To foul transgression, shall again be piled
 With funeral heaps : but every pious soul
 Shall live again on earth, by God endured
 With spirit, breath, and vigour : they His grace
 Shall endlessly adore. O man, thrice bless'd !
 Who so shall see that day, and seeing, live !

These last lines, which conclude the book, are preserved in their fulness only in the Apostolic Constitutions (book 7). The concluding verses in the Sibylline MSS. were probably mutilated by some over-orthodox transcriber, for the purpose of bringing them into better agreement with the Apocalypse.

Next in age to the fourth book, comes that which is usually called the Proem. This was first edited in the *Princeps Editio* of Theophilus to Autolycus,—the same work which has been of late so ably translated by Mr. Flower,—in 1545, and at once created a sensation among the learned of Europe. From that time to this, it has stood as the preface to the whole collection of Oracles. Nothing is clearer than that this is the composition of a scholar in the Christian school of Alexandria: not only the general species of ratiocination is sufficient to prove the fact, but the reference made over and over again to the unfortunate cats whom the Egyptians turned into gods, is a proof in the same direction. Thus, in verse 60—

αἰσχυρῶτε γαλᾶς καὶ κνώδαλα θειοποιούντες.

And again—

προσκυνέοντες ὄφεις, κίνας, αἰλούρους, ἀνήτοι,
 καὶ πετέεωα σέβασθε, καὶ ἐρπετὰ θηρία γαίης.

It has been made a question, indeed, whether this Proem were not the work of an Alexandrian Jew, coeval with Ptolemy Philometor. But the references to the joys and glories of

paradise which constantly occur here and there; and again, and especially, the mention of the Bread of Heaven, 'the Bread of Angelic Hosts:' 'the Sweet Bread of the starry heaven'—must be sufficient to settle the question; for what Alexandrian Jew ever thus spoke? And again, the phrase, ζῶν κληρονομοῦσι, is not to be found in the Old Testament; and only twice is a similar expression to be met with, namely in Ecclesiasticus iv. 14, and xx. 25. Again, Paradise spoken of as eternal felicity occurs nowhere in the Old Testament, except in Ecclus. xlv. 16; and then not in the Greek, but only in the Latin version.

The so-called eighth book comes next. This is divided into four different portions by great lacunæ, and of these the two last are of a later date. The first is cited by Lactantius, but is manifestly later than the second. This second part begins with the celebrated acrostich, of which we will first give S. Augustine's version—that which is engraved at Ulm:—

Judicii signum, tellus sudore madescet.
 E cœlo Rex adveniet per sæcla futurus,
 Scilicet in carne præsens ut judicet orbem.
 Unde Deum cernent incredulus atque fidelis
 Celsum cum sanctis, ævi jam termino in ipso.
 Sic animæ cum carne aderunt, quas judicat ipse,
 Cum jacet incultus densis in vepribus orbis.
 Rejicient simulacra viri, cunctam quoque gazam:
 Exuret terras ignis, pontumque, polumque,
 Inquirens; tetri portas exuret Averni.
 Sanctorum sed enim cunctæ lux libera carni
 Tradetur; sontes æternum flamma cremabit.
 Occultos actos retegens tunc quisque loquetur;
 Secreta, atque Deus reserabit pectora luci.
 Tunc erit et luctus; stridebunt dentibus omnes.
 Eripitur solis jubar, et chorus interit astris;
 Volvetur cœlum; lunaris splendor obibit:
 Dejiciet colles, valles extollet ab imo:
 Non erit in rebus hominum sublime vel altum:
 Jam æquantur campis montes, et cœrula ponti
 Omnia cessabunt, tellus confracta peribit:
 Sic pariter fontes torrentur fluminaque igni.
 Sed tuba tunc sonitum tristem dimittet ab alto
 Orbe, gemens facinus miserum variosque labores;
 Tartareumque chaos monstrabit terra dehiscens;
 Et coram hic Domino reges sistentur ad unum;
 Recidet e cœlis ignisque et sulphuris amnis.

The initials of S. Augustine's version run thus:—

Jesucs Creistos Teu Dnios Soter.

The *c* in the first word is simply the effect of a desire to imitate the shape, as well as the sound, of the Greek sigma. The *e* in Creistos is the faithful copy of the original. The *Dn* in the

fourth word seems to have been intended to express the soft sound of the 'T. The other translations given by Alexandre are—that of an anonymous writer, quoted by Onuphrius Pannius, which simply gives the Greek letters: one by Onuphrius himself—Jesus Christus Dei Filius Servator Crux: one by Castalio—Jesus Chreistus Dei Filius Servator Cruce: by Aitzema—Jesus Christus Dei Filius, Servator. Cruc.: and by the Editor—Jesus Christus Dei Filius Salus in Cruce.

After so many attempts, it is surely our own duty to try this bow of Ulysses:—

J udgment at hand, the earth shall sweat with fear :
E ternal King, the Judge shall come on high :
S hall doom all flesh : shall bid the world appear
U nveiled before His Throne. Him every eye
S hall, just or unjust, see in majesty.

C onsummate time shall view the Saints assemble,
H is own assessors : and the souls of men
R ound the great judgment-seat shall wail and tremble
I n fear of sentence. And the green earth then
S hall turn to desert : they that see that day
T o moles and bats their gods shall cast away.

S ea, earth, and heaven, and hell's dread gates shall burn :
O bedient to their call, the dead return :
N or shall the Judge unfitting doom discern :

O f chains and darkness to each wicked soul :
F or them that have done good, the starry pole.

G nashing of teeth, and woe, and fierce despair
O f such as hear the righteous Judge declare
D eeds long forgot, which that last day shall bare.

T hen, when each darken'd breast He brings to sight,
H eaven's stars shall fall ; and day be changed to night ;
E ffaced the sun-ray, and the moon's pale light.

S urely the valleys He on high shall raise ;
A ll hills shall cease, all mountains turn to plain ;
V essel shall no more pass the watery ways :
I n the dread lightning parching earth shall blaze,
O gygian rivers seek to flow in vain :
U nutterable woe the trumpet blast,
R e-echoing through the ether, shall forecast.

T hen Tartarus shall wrap the world in gloom,
H igh chiefs and princes shall receive their doom,
E ternal fire and brimstone for their tomb.

C rown of the world, sweet wood, salvation's horn,
R earing its beauty, shall for man be born :
O wood, that Saints adore, and sinners scorn !
S o from twelve fountains shall its light be poured :
S taff of the Shepherd, and victorious sword.

With this acrostich may be well compared the remarkable epitaph, discovered at Autun, and first transcribed by Dom Pitra in 1839. We here give it, as restored partly by him, partly by Alexandre; with one reading, to be mentioned in its place, of our own. The acrostich is *ιχθύς εις αεί*:—

Ἰχθύς οὐρανίου θεῖον γένος ἤτορι σεμνῷ
 Χρήσε λαλῶ[ν φωνή]ν ἀμβροτον ἐν βροταῖς·
 Θεσπεσίῳ ὑδάτων τῇ σῇν, φίλε, θάλπεο ψυχήν
 Ὑδασιν ἀενάοις πλουτοδότου σοφίης·
 Σωτήρος δ' ἀγίην μελιθεά λάμβανε βρῶ[σιν]
 Ἔσθιε, πίνε, δι[υεῖ]ν ἰχθύν ἔχων παλάμην·
 Ἰχθυ Χ[ριστὲ] μέγα, Γαλιλαίων δέσποτα Σῶτερ,
 Συγγενέων β[υ]πτήρ, σὲ λιτάζομε, φῶς τῶ θανάτων
 Ἀ[λέξ]ανδρε πάτερ, τῷ μὲ κεχαρισμένε θυμῷ,
 Εὐμνήστω σὺν μητρὶ καὶ ἀδελφοῖσιν ἐμοῖσιν
 Ἰ[λαθι, καὶ παιδὸς] μνήσεο Πεκτορίου.

The *συγγενέων* seemed to us, when we saw the stone, next to certain. Alexandre's reading is *συσσίτων*, which *may* be right: the acrostich forbids that which others read, *εὐσεβέων*.

The minute prophecies of our Lord's life, which occur in this book, are thus referred to by S. Justin (Cohort. § 38):—
πέισθητε τῇ ἀρχαιοτάτῃ καὶ σφόδρα παλαιᾷ Σιβύλλῃ, ἥς τὰς βίβλους ἐν πάσῃ τῇ οἰκουμένην σώζεσθαι συμβαίνει, περὶ μὲν τῶν λεγομένων θεῶν ὡς μὴ ὄντων ἀπὸ τινος δυνατῆς ἐπιπνοίας διὰ χρησμῶν ὑμᾶς διδασκούσῃ· περὶ δὲ τῆς τοῦ Σωτήρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μελλούσης ἔσεσθαι παρουσίας καὶ περὶ πάντων τῶν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ γένεσθαι μελλόντων σαφῶς καὶ φανερώς προαναφαινούσῃ.

Next to this, in respect of antiquity, comes the first part of the eighth book. This describes very clearly the date of its own composition. After the reign of fifteen Roman emperors there shall be a king, says the Sibyl, with white hair: and the effigy of Hadrian is then drawn to the life. After this, *in the last days*, (and notice that expression,) there shall be three kings, whose names shall resemble that of Adonai—that is, the Antonines: and the misery of the human race during the period of their empire is most graphically described. After this we come to a mere guess-work of prophecy: how, when a fiery dragon shall come across the water, carrying a body of troops in its belly who shall fight against Rome,—then will be the end of the world, the signs of which are described again at length. It is next to certain, then, that this part of the book was written under Antoninus Pius; but not immediately after his accession: because he is here called old, whereas he was but fifty-four when he ascended the imperial throne. It is also almost certain that our poet had before his eyes that which we now call the fourth book, and that which is reckoned the second part of the

eighth, from which he appears to quote two lines. Of this also let us give a specimen:—

And after him, in Time's approaching end,
Three shall have rule, who bear God's highest name,
That name, whose might and glory lives for aye.
Of these, the first, now aged, yet shall hold
The sceptre for long years : a gloomy king,
Who shall shut up all wealth of every realm
Within his treasure-house, that when from far,
The matricide, returning, claims his own,
He may enrich his Asia with the spoil.

We shall have occasion shortly to unravel this prophecy : at present we may observe that after the eighth we may place the fifth book; the authorship of which is a question of great difficulty. It would appear, however, that, although some passages seem to be taken from the New Testament, the probability on the whole is, that the writer was a Jew; but whether Christian or Jew, he was undoubtedly an Egyptian, and therefore an Alexandrian. Alexandre makes him almost contemporary with the writer of the first part of the eighth book—perhaps a few years later. But to us the reference to the extinction of the fire of Vesta seems too clear to be passed over as an index to the real date. Now, according to Herodian, the destruction of the Temple of Vesta by fire took place in the year 191; and very soon after that this book would appear to have been composed.

Not to be tedious, next would follow the third part of the third book; then the sixth and seventh; then the first and second, which as poetical compositions, perhaps, claim the first place. Let us give a few specimens of them. The first book commences thus:—

Beginning from the earliest race of man
Until the latter day, my song shall tell
That which hath been, and is, and must be yet
In this world's history through human sin.
And, first, the God commands me that I say
How this world sprang to being. Thou, give ear
Lest thou forget that mightiest King of kings
Who said, "Let all things be," and all things were.
He set the earth on chaos, gave sweet light,
Arched high the heavens and smoothed the hoary sea,
And crowned the pole with stars, a tire of flame,
Adorned the earth with flowers, and fed the deep
With flowing rivers; through the air dispersed
Thick mists and dewy clouds. And next he formed
The fishy tribes of ocean; gave the birds
To soar amidst the air, and filled the woods
With beasts of divers races, and with them
That creep upon the ground; yea, all that is,
All that man views around him, owns his hand.

Then comes, in close accordance with the Book of Genesis, the history of the Fall; and partly from that and partly from the poetic tradition of the gold and silver ages, an account of the gradual deterioration of the human race. In his description of the Deluge, the pseudo-Sibyl has evidently in mind that most noble passage in Hesiod where Jupiter is represented as putting forth all his strength to crush the rebellious giants; and—which we do not remember to have seen noticed by any of the commentators on Milton—our own poet seems to have availed himself of the Sibylline description. Let us give the two passages. Thus Hesiod speaks (we quote from Elton's translation):—

—— No longer then did Jove
Curb his full power: but instant in his soul
There grew dilated strength, and it was filled
With his omnipotence. At once he loosed
His whole of might, and put forth all the god.
The vaulted sky, the mount Olympian, flashed
With his continual presence; for he passed
Incessant forth, and scattered fires on fires.
Hurl'd from his hardy grasp the lightnings flew
Reiterated swift; the whirling flash
Cast sacred splendour, and the thunderbolt
Fell: roar'd around the nurture-yielding earth
In conflagration; for on every side
The immensity of forests crackling blazed:
Yea, the broad world burn'd red; the streams that mix
With ocean, and the deserts of the sea.

The Sibylline Oracles read thus:

Then pass'd his wife, his sons, then pass'd their wives
Into the wooden castle: after them
Those other tribes, whom God had willed to save.
But when the key had loosed its iron bolt,
And made all fast, the LORD's celestial will
Began its own accomplishment: He drove
Cloud over cloud, and hid the fiery disk:
And moon and stars, and heavenly coronet
He cover'd with His darkness: thunder'd loud,
O dread alarm to mortals! forth He sent
The whirlwind of His wrath; all winds that blew
He heap'd up one on other: at His word
The founts of the great deep were broken up:
The cataracts of heav'n descended, all
The abysses measureless of earth, unseal'd,
Pour'd forth their flood of waters: yea, the waves
Ten thousand times ten thousand, leapt and whirl'd
Over the boundless plains: and from the house
Of God Himself, with wind and waters black
The fierce loud billows dash'd adown the sky,
And all was wildest uproar; while the ark
Cutting the boundless foam, securely rode
On the wild motion of the plangent waves.

The last line, in the original, may vie with that of Homer, in his epithet of the sea:—

στείρα, κυνμένων ὑδάτων κελαρύζομενάων.

At its conclusion the poem—greatly to the surprise of its annotators—without any connecting link or other notice of the vast gap of time between the two events, proceeds to the coming of the Son of GOD. But most naturally: the Christian author, under the heathen impersonation, had been taught by S. Peter that the like figure, even baptism, does also now save us: was led from the ark to remember the Church; and by the Church was called at once to the Founder of that Church and His Incarnation. And thus he proceeds:—

But when the unmeasur'd billowy surge that seethed
Out of the huge abysses, now at length
Shall hear God's voice, and lessening, lessening still,
Sink back rebuked; and once again the heights
Of mountain peaks, and bold sea-breasting capes
Shall beetle as of old: then He, GOD's Son,
Son of the Living God, shall take man's flesh
Incarnate, and converse with Adam's race.
Now mark His name: four vowels shall it bear;
One consonant repeated: in its sound
Eight hundreds, decads eight, and monads eight.
Thus shalt thou know, and knowing shalt adore,
The eternal Father's co-eternal Son,
Anointed for His mission. He the law
Shall not destroy, but rather shall fulfil
In all its full significance of type,
And teach its holiest meaning. Priests shall come,
And bring their gold, their frankincense, their myrrh,
As seers have prophesied.

And running very briefly through our Blessed LORD's life, the Sibyl thus concludes the first book:—

But when He shall extend those glorious hands
And measure all things, and shall wear the crown
With thorns inwoven; when His glorious side
Is wounded with the spear, and night shall reign
For three hours' space amidst the height of day,
Then shall the Solomonian Temple show
A mighty sign, what time the King descends
To Hades, preaching freedom to the dead.
But when three days shall pass, then, death o'erthrown,
He shall ascend to light, and teach the way
That mortal steps must follow; and at length
He, rising glorious to His native heaven,
Shall point the road which leads His followers there.
Thenceforth the apostles shall be this world's guides,
And prophets' voice be silent evermore.

Or if Hexameters shall seem to give a better idea of the Sibylline works, take the following passage from the same book:—

This is the contest for man,—the prizes proposed for the soldier,
 This is the Gate of Life, and sweet Immortality's portal :
 God shall extend it to those that are greatest and truest of athletes,
 In that they fought this fight,—and they that shall merit the guerdon,
 Thus having won the reward, shall enter the Kingdom of Glory.

Then shall the end be at hand, when many a prophet of falsehood,
 Filling the earth with his lies, shall deceive those ignorant thousands.
 Belial also shall come, and performing deceivable wonders,
 Draw away crowds to his worship. With mighty and dread devastation
 Shall the elect be o'erwhelm'd—o'erwhelm'd both Gentiles and Hebrews.
 Happy beyond compare, thrice happy and blessed the servant,
 Whom, when He knocks, the Lord shall find awaiting His advent !
 Noon it may be when He comes, or midnight ; cock-crow, or twilight :
 But of a truth come He *SHALL*,—and prophecy then be accomplish'd.

We must not, however, pass without notice, the curious insertion, in the second book, of about a hundred verses from the moral poem of Phocylides. For an insertion it clearly is, and the way in which the coarsest and foulest lines of the original poem are either omitted or softened by the Christian compiler, is very curious ; and a complete proof that the poem in question was not for the first time composed by the writer of the Sibylline compositions.

Last of all, in age, come the eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth books—first published by Cardinal Mai, at Rome, in 1828 ; except that the fourteenth had been already brought to light by Sluve, at Milan, in 1817.

We will now call attention to a few theological peculiarities of these books.

We have the most clear evidence of the orthodoxy of the Christian writers as to the Divinity of our Lord.

viii. 2. οὗτος ὁ κῦν προγραφείς ἐν ἀκροστιχίαις Θεοῦ δὲ
 ἡμῶν.

Again : viii. 462.

δέξαι ἐν ἀχράντοις Θεοῦ δὲ σοῖς, Παρθένε, κόλπος.

And still more plainly at v. 474—

ἀλλ' οὐδὲν μέγα θαῦμα Θεοῦ Πατρὶ καὶ Θεῷ Υἱῷ.

And so again, in the same book, v. 264 (it is a passage which Milton may have studied)—

αὐτὸν γὰρ πρῶτιστα λαβὼν σύμβουλον ἀπ' ἀρχῆς
 εἶπεν ὁ Παντακράτωρ, Πουήσωμεν, Τέκνον ἀμφω
 εἰκόνας ἐξ ἰδιότης ἀπομαζάμενοι βροτὰ φύλα
 νῦν μὲν Ἐγὼ χερσίν, σὺ δ' ἔπειτα λόγῳ θεραπεύσεις
 μορφὴν ἡμετέρην.

Nor are the poems less explicit as to the Incarnation :—

xii. 32. καὶ τότε δὴ κρύφιος ἦξει Λόγος Ὑψίστου
 σάρκα φέρων θνητοῖσιν ὁμοῖον. . . .

But here an exception must be made.

The sixth and seventh books, orthodox on our Lord's Divinity, are grossly—though we may fairly hope, unintentionally—heretical on His Incarnation; which they appear to connect, in some extraordinary way, with His Baptism;—a heresy which Irenæus attributes to some of the Cerinthians, and S. Epiphanius to the Ebionites. The passages are too long to quote, but may be found in vi. 3 and vii. 66.

The signs which our poets give of the end of the world are principally these:—

Mighty appearances in Heaven, iii. 334; v. 154; ii. 84.

Children with grey hairs at birth, ii. 154.

General barrenness of women, ii. 163.

The Fall of the Roman Empire, in numberless passages.

Antichrist.

The coming of Elijah.

The reign of a woman.

As to the grey hairs of children, it seems to have been simply a Gentile tradition.

Hesiod, *Opp. et Dies*, 178:—

Zeûs δ' ὀλέσσει καὶ τοῦτο γένος μέροσων ἀνθρώπων
εὖτ' ἂν γινόμενοι πολιοκράταιοι τελίθωσι.

With respect to the Fall of the Roman Empire, the Sibyl gives credit to a common prophecy, drawn from the numeral letters of *Ῥωμη*.

τρίς δὲ τριηκοσίους καὶ τεσσαράκοντα καὶ ὀκτὼ
πληρώσεις λυκάβαντας, ὅταν σοι δῦσμος ἤξη
μοῖρα βιαζομένη, τὸν οὖνομα πληρώσασα.

That is, that the 948th year of the city would be fatal to it.

But though the writer of this prophecy did not live to see that 948th year, the 2d of Severus—in which nothing happened—yet his continuer in the thirteenth book had actually outlived the time, and was forced to make another prophecy; something after the fashion of Dr. Cumming's errata in respect of the period of the Last Day. The second guess, however, was no more fortunate than the first. He devised the theory, that Rome had really been founded 105 years later than her *fasti* declared; and the fatal year, thus postponed again, fell in the 5th of Diocletian, by which time the bard—of the age of Aurelian—was doubtless sleeping well in the Catacombs, and very little concerned with the future of his augury.

Antichrist. The Sibylline idea seems to have been that this was Nero; an idea which long survived that monster's own life. One of those strange popular delusions, which also fixed on Sebastian of Portugal, and our own Edward V.—and, long

before, on Arthur—affirmed that Nero was not really dead; that he had escaped the vengeance of the Senate by flying into Parthia; that he would thence some day return, and again possessing himself of Rome, become the Antichrist of prophecy. The way in which the Sibyl interprets the prediction in the Revelation appears to be this (Rev. xvii. 8): ‘The beast that thou sawest, was and is not, and shall ascend out of the bottomless pit, and go into perdition. . . . The seven heads are seven mountains, on which the woman sitteth. And there are seven kings: five are fallen’—Augustus, Tiberius, Caius, Claudius, Nero—‘and one is’—Galba—‘and the other is not yet come’—Otho—‘and when he cometh, he must continue a short space. And the beast that was and is not,’ namely Nero, ‘even he is the eighth’—that is to say, is rising again under the form of Vespasian, ‘and goeth into perdition. And the ten horns which thou sawest, are ten kings, which have received no kingdom as yet,’—that is, Vespasian, Titus, Domitian, Nerva, Trajan, Adrian, Antoninus, Aurelius, Pertinax, Commodus.

But when it was manifest that the fifteenth Roman emperor had departed this life, and still no appearance of Antichrist, while the length of time that had elapsed since the reign of Nero rendered the expectation of his return impossible, another belief began to possess the Church. It now began to be said that Antichrist, though he might have found a type in Nero, would be a Jew; by his father of the tribe of Dan, by his mother a Samaritan. There are various reasons to be drawn from Scripture for the selection of that tribe. In the first place, its omission in the list of those that each afforded their twelve thousand in the Revelation. Next, that in the prophetic declaration, after the mention of Dan, the patriarch exclaims, ‘I have waited for thy salvation, O LORD;’ as if there were another salvation, and another LORD in some way connected with that tribe. And this belief lasted down into the Middle Ages; inasmuch that in such writers as S. Hrabanus Maurus, Abælard, Rupert, and the like, the current opinion seems to be that when a pope of the tribe of Dan shall ascend the chair of S. Peter, it is he that will be Antichrist. And in the writings of the later Sibylline bards, Belial, or Beliar, is the name by which Antichrist is called.

The next sign of the end of the world is the coming of Elijah. This is distinctly referred to in book ii. line 187. The poet writes thus:—

And then the Tishbite in a fiery car
Descending from the heavens, shall show these signs
That herald the approach of this world's end.
Woe, woe, for them that then shall bear the load

Of near maternity! Woe, woe, for them
That to their helpless babes give suck! For them
That dwell beside the sea! Woe, woe, for all
That shall behold that day, if day it be,
When o'er the boundless earth a pitchy cloud
From east to west, from north to south shall roll.
Then shall this stream of blazing flame go forth
Before the heavenly throne, and laying waste
Both earth and ocean, every creek and bay,
Each lake and stream, each fountain, and the depths
That lie beneath the earth, shall glitter, high
Even to the heavenly poles.

What the three miracles are that Elijah, in his character as one of the two witnesses, is to perform, does not seem so certain. Probably the Sibyl, applying Rev. xi. 5, 6, to that prophet alone, reckoned them thus:—1. 'If any man will hurt 'them, fire proceedeth out of their mouth, and devoureth their 'enemies.' 2. 'These have power to shut heaven, that it rain 'not, in the days of their prophecy.' 3. 'And have power 'over waters to turn them to blood.'

Of the heterodox teaching of the Sibylline books, that which has excited the greatest attention is the denial—occurring, however, only in one place, ii. 300—of the eternity of future punishment:—

τοῖς καὶ ὁ παντοκράτης Θεὸς ἀφθιτος ἄλλο παρέξει
εὐσεβέσιν, ὑπόταν Θεὸν ἀφθιτον αἰτήσωνται
ἐκ μαλεροῖο πυρὸς μακραιώνων τ' ἀπὸ βρυγμῶν
ἀνθρώπους σῶσαι δώσει· καὶ τοῦτο ποιήσει
λεξάμενος γὰρ ἕκαστον ἀπὸ φλογὸς ἐκαμάτου
ἄλλοσ' ἀποστήσας πέμψει διὰ λαὸν ἑαυτοῦ
εἰς ζωὴν ἐτέραν καὶ αἰώνιον ἀθανάτουσιν
'Ηλυσίῳ πεδίῳ.

This is the very doctrine of Origen, but emphatically denounced by the copyist of one of the best Sibylline MSS. in certain tuneless lines, which savour of the seventh or eighth century:—

ψευδὴ προφανῶς· οὐδὲ γὰρ λήξα ποτὲ
τὸ πῦρ κολάζον τοὺς κατακεκριμένους
καγὼ γὰρ ἂν εὐξαιμι τοῦθ' οὕτως ἔχειν
οὐλαῖς μεγίσταις σφαλμάτων ἐστιγμένους.
αἱ μείζονος χρήζουσι φιλανθρωπίας
ἀλλ' αἰσχυνέσθω φληναφῶν Ὀριγένης,
πέρας γενέσθαι τῶν κολασέων λέγων.

The teaching with respect to angels is very full and well developed. We read, in the seventh book, of a kind of angelic guardianship, though perhaps not precisely that which the later Church has held:—

οἱ δὲ διαγγελτῆρες ὑπαὶ ποσὶ κοιμήσονται,
οἱ τε πυρὸς φαίνουσι, καὶ οἱ ποταμοὺς φαίνουσιν,
οἱ τ' ἄστη σώζουσι, καὶ οἱ πέμπουσιν ἀήτας.

The names of some of the angels are clearly taken from the apocryphal books, and more especially from that of Enoch :—

ἡζουρ 'Ιρεμιήλ, 'Οριήλ, Σαυήλ, 'Αζαήλ

—or 'Αζαζήλ—Oriel is, of course, Uriel; but Azazel in the book of Enoch (chap. xlii. and lxviii.) is a demon. Hence our great poet, whose learning really seems unfathomable :—

' that proud honour claim'd

Azazel as his right, a cherub tall.'

It had been our intention to add somewhat on the—we can only call them so—*vagaries* of the Sibylline metre. But we fear that the subject is not, to the greater part of our readers, of sufficient interest to warrant such a disquisition. We will, therefore, end by simply recommending the study of these curious books to those who would learn the politico-religious views of the third and fourth centuries; to those who are interested in prophetic interpretations of the Apocalypse; and to those who would see the gradual shading off of Alexandrine Judaism into Alexandrine Christianity: the two so clearly presenting a certain community of features; and yet so marvelously, so irreconcilably at variance.

And we are bound once more to express the great obligations which ecclesiastical scholars have incurred to M. Alexandre, for this most laborious, most accurate, most admirable edition of one of the hardest—most corrupt—most obscure—of all works. Surely he will apply his learning and talent to the elucidation of some other monument of antiquity, if not more intrinsically valuable, at least probably more universally interesting.

ART. III.—1. *History of the Life and Times of Edmund Burke.* By THOMAS MACKNIGHT. Vol. III. London: Chapman and Hall. 1860.

2. *Recollections and Private Memoirs of Washington.* By his adopted son, GEORGE WASHINGTON PARKE CUSTIS. New York: Derby and Jackson. 1860.

WE join these two volumes under one notice, rather for the contrast, than for the resemblance between them; because, that is, the two heroes of them were so very unlike, though each a thorough representative of the Anglo-Saxon race, and their fortunes so very unequal, though the genius of each was, in its kind, equally pre-eminent. Because, further, the one book, being a fair sample of the school of biography, which assumes it to be merely a special portion of history, is well written, and yet tells us so little; the other (the American), a specimen of the more personal and anecdotal kind, is faulty in style, and yet tells us so much.

Mr. Macknight's third and concluding volume embraces the period of Burke's life marked by his efforts against Warren Hastings, and the progress of the French Revolution. Our generation, which has forgotten his labours for purging Parliament of its place- and pension-mongering scandals, and has received from the somewhat ungrateful Whig party but very slender intimations of his less public task of cementing that party, under the auspices of Lord Rockingham, and of teaching it what its principles really were and must grow into, still is attracted by, and inquires into his part and standing-point in those mighty events.

The great achievement of Burke's career is popularly considered to be the prosecution of Warren Hastings; he himself seems to have so esteemed it. It was, indeed, the darling of his old age, when he was now losing authority, and sometimes even respect, in the House of Commons. It was the last great occasion on which, when now disowned almost by his old disciples of the Whig party, he once more stood forward as their acknowledged leader. In the features of the case there was something grandly poetical and, also, apparently practical. It was to be shown by the trial, that a nation could kindle with the sentiment of compassion and the love of justice, like an individual; and that each particular act of iniquity perpetrated under the auspices of uncontrolled power, thousands of miles

away, could be brought under the cognizance and condemnation of the British Legislature. That there was something theatrical and unreal in the display was not Burke's fault, but incident to the very essence of the matter; and the same may be said for the unexampled prolixity of the proceedings, and the final vagueness of the result. The trial itself seems scarcely to have been projected by Burke. We are told that he did not believe it possible to convict Hastings, or that it would ever have come to an impeachment. He only wanted to have his charges supported by a respectable minority in the Commons, and this seemed to him a sufficient justification. And so it seems to us; and, also, that 'all the conjectures about his wishing to 'avenge on Hastings the downfall of the Coalition Ministry, 'and thus retrieve the fortunes of the field, are not supported 'by facts.'

Yet, in the conduct of the case, his demeanour appears to us open to the gravest censure. We do not think, with Mr. Mac-knight, that when the Opposition endeavoured to force into the number of its managers, Francis, the late Governor's deadly enemy, it was a *weak* reply of Pitt to Windham, that "however 'gentlemen might reason, there was a feeling against appointing 'a man who had certainly been an enemy of Hastings, and had 'met him in mortal conflict, one of his public prosecutors;' on the contrary, Burke's persistency in demanding such a selection was grossly indecent; and the argument, that the Commons were not judges, but simply prosecutors, merely sophistical, it being altogether opposed to the practice and spirit, if not to the letter of ordinary law, to have for an advocate against the accused his own personal foe. Exception should, on yet deeper principles of justice, be taken to the statesman's conduct during the progress, and on the conclusion of the prosecution. What possible right could a prosecutor have to retort even an insult to himself, by branding the accused as 'that wicked wretch, that scourge of India, that criminal;' or, still further, to struggle against the design of reimbursing the acquitted statesman the cost of his defence. It appears to us the most apparent equity, that when a public servant had been absolved, after many years of the most agonizing anxiety, and after having been for all that time proposed as a mark for the wit and declamation of the greatest, and, if we think of Sheridan, we may say, not always the most conscientious of orators, and declared to be innocent of every wickedness laid to his charge, the nation in whose cause he had incurred the odium—which the same people, by its highest court of judicature, had pronounced to be baseless,—should at least make the small atonement in its power, by paying debts which, but for services performed on its behalf, he would never have

accumulated. It may be said (Burke, indeed, was always assuming it) that, though acquitted, he was guilty. We think this not at all improbable; but how is such an allegation to the point? It is not allowed in the interest of ordinary plaintiffs in civil disputes, it is equally unnatural in criminal causes, first to confirm and recognise the authority of judges, by bringing the matter before them, and as soon as a sentence contrary to one's wishes has been uttered, to disclaim it. Either no verdict against Hastings could have been fairly carried into execution, or a verdict for him should have been allowed by the prosecutors to have been effectual. The theory of a trial is, that the accusers—in this case, the managers for the House of Commons—believe a crime to have been committed, and by a particular person, but that by carrying the thing before a court, they make it an umpire between them and the accused. When the sentence of acquittal was given by this court, it was entirely illogical in Burke to argue that the Minister's report to the House of Commons—to carry into effect, as it were, the sentence, by putting the late Governor into the same position pecuniarily as he was in before the proceedings commenced—was 'a kind of 'censure upon the managers of the impeachment, and a practical 'contradiction' to the vote that an impeachment should be conducted; that is, a vote, not that Hastings was guilty, but that there was sufficient appearance of guilt to warrant a solemn judicial inquiry into it. This is a point to which, we believe, not enough attention has been generally directed. We concur with the common conclusion of our times, and, indeed, of contemporaries, that great offences had been perpetrated against that British theory of the morality of government, which no Englishman has a right to disavow on the shallow principle that the corresponding duties of subjects are not recognised in the East; and we certainly shall not worry our readers with repetitions of this *crambe repetita* any more than with prolix disquisitions on the authorship of Junius. But the question of the propriety of Burke's obstinate resistance to the graceful act of parliamentary benevolence, in pensioning the victim of the inherent lengthiness of a prosecution for the misgovernment of a great empire, is one of a very different nature.

Mankind have become pardonably weary of hearing of this trial, which had no direct result, and the use of which in history seems rather too like that of an exhibition of wax-works, to introduce, that is, a fine pageant of great names and sounding titles, not to illustrate the character of their bearers, or of their times. The one point of interest in it is any light which may possibly be thrown from it upon the character of the great orator whose energy in reality created it. His fervid imagina-

tion, we doubt not, was influenced by the splendid spectacle, equally with the spectators who made part of it, and those who now read of it in Macaulay's noble essay; but it was assuredly not for the sake of a grand occasion for display that he took the front rank in the solemnity. The ardour of his fancy must not be confounded with vanity; it maddened him when he probed into the intricacies of statesmanship in an Asiatic dependency; so that, Mr. Macknight confesses, his temper grew worse with the anxiety of the impeachment, and he showed himself, 'on many occasions, more violent and intemperate than any of his political associates.' The details of despotism were so vividly present to his mind, that he could not understand how, except from guilty obstinacy, they did not work the same effect of wrath against the offender in the hearts of all his contemporaries. But this was no new feature in his character, or even his conduct. As his biographer observes of the harshness of the 'Letter to a noble Lord,' so now, 'it was the grief itself which produced the bitterness,'—the grief of seeing himself virtually abandoned by his old associates, and admired only for the philosophic faculty of theorizing which men of theory themselves so very commonly are the most inclined to despise. But it was only in degree that any change in his demeanour can be allowed to have taken place at this time. Robert Hall was right in declaring that those who had studied carefully Burke's earlier works, had little reason for astonishment at his subsequent conduct. He was at all times a Cassandra, preaching without result; and the true causes of this phenomenon in his fortunes may be traced in his disposition. He himself was ever fond of saying, that he 'hated the very sound of an abstract principle;' that he 'was no enthusiast, but a sober, reflecting man;' and of holding himself out, so far as accordant with morality, as a professor of expediency. Yet this was the man who harangued powerfully against the war with America, for the condemnation of Warren Hastings, for a war with the French Revolutionists, and whose plans and arguments on all three occasions proved, in appearance, conspicuously without issue. The truth is, that he had a great genius for the philosophy of statesmanship, and great insight into human character, but very little power of sifting the relation between the nature of particular individuals and of the circumstances in which they were to act. It was with him, as it might be with a chemist in a dyeing factory: the man of science could well expound the general effects of a special application, but not apply the rule to an individual object as skilfully as the workman to whom practice has given a new instinct of sight and touch. The fact that his pleadings produced so little effect

must have been apparent enough to the orator ; but he always refused to refer this to any defect in his own tactics.

Mr. Macknight appears to concur thoroughly in Burke's own estimate of his practical skill. Because he forced the House of Commons to vote the impeachment of the late Governor-General of India, he thinks he was completely successful, though the trial ended in the acquittal of the accused. On the same principle, Lord George Gordon might claim to be released from the limbo of lunatic enthusiasts, in which he is still confined by the verdict of posterity, on the ground that he succeeded in raising an agitation, though he could not make it fruitful of any effect. The phenomenon, however, of a man of great genius coveting and asserting the possession of practical ability when he has it not, is by no means so uncommon as to afford reasonable room for the mistake so often made by their admirers in assenting to their pretensions. Burke clearly saw the faults of a system : the fault of the Tories in continuing an useless conflict with the colonies ; the fault of the Radicals of the era of the French Revolution in their wild doctrine of universal equality. His vision was so clear, that he felt himself an inspired opponent of these errors of parties ; but it naturally escaped his observation, that, as his adversaries had gone wrong by consulting their prejudices, so he had detected their aberrations by the aid of counter-prejudices in himself, and which, suffered to stray uncontrolled, would have led a statesman, with real power in his hands, into equally dangerous extremes. It would be paradoxical to deny him the possession of judgment altogether, for an acute critical power, in relation both to men and measures, is one of his most distinguishing characteristics ; but what he failed in, was the habit, and perhaps the faculty, of applying this critical sagacity to himself. He might preside at the council of war, and give the watchword ; but a much cooler head, a man who could see the strong as well as the weak points in an enemy's defences, was needed to command in action. Inconsistency, it is true, cannot fairly be imputed to him ; at least, not that inconsistency which can in any way diminish men's opinion of a statesman's good faith. As we look back from this vantage-ground of almost a century onward, we perceive that Burke was right in opposing Grenville's administration on their American policy, not so entirely without a defence for aiding in the formation of the Coalition Ministry, right in his attacks on the exercise of royal prerogative by which that cabinet was shattered, and right again in attacking the assaults upon royal prerogative in France and in England by advanced Radicals. But is this circumstance, viz., that inconsistency cannot be brought home to a man, by itself evidence of great statesmanlike powers ? If statesmanship

consists in governing men, it certainly is not. Besides many other qualities, it is not sufficient merely to support the opinion on the face of it seemingly opposed to old tenets; but the statesman must not, while maintaining new dogmas, seem to have abandoned the old. Burke was in the right at both periods of his parliamentary career; but he stood somewhat in the position of a renegade in the eyes of his contemporaries, because, in the triumph of liberalism abroad, he threw himself, with his whole weight, into the opposite scale, as though the iniquities of a party in one country could ever justify the desertion of the analogous party in another. Burke argued as though Liberals were, if not to abnegate, at all events to preserve complete silence about their principles in England, because those principles abroad had been perverted. It was this that alienated from him and enraged his old companions, not altogether without reason; and it was a character which led him at different periods of his life into conduct of this sort, which has, without detracting from his greatness in the eyes of posterity as a philosophical statesman, justified, at the same time, the demeanour of men like Fox towards him.

Persons who assert that he was guided by corrupt motives in acting as he did, by offended vanity, if not by the grosser incentives of self-interest, are not worth reasoning with. In no sense of the term can he be called a selfish man; but yet he was the prey of an absorbing, however noble, egotism: a feeling that his own sentiments were the true standard by which all true patriots should gauge theirs. This is a common accompaniment of that literary type which is observed to predominate, not merely in professional men of letters, but even in some lawyers and statesmen. It is a tone of thought which redeems their words and writings from the risk of superannuation; but it is, in almost every case, indicative of some want of capacity for adaptation to the exigencies of the time. It was this egotism which 'broke into fragments,' as Lord John Russell confesses, in his 'Life of Fox,' 'the great and firm body of the English Whigs.' It was this same quality, or rather colour of disposition and temperament, which, as before the French Revolution it had caused him to be, as Mr. Macknight says was the case, 'not on the best of terms with his party, particularly Sheridan and Fox, his advice 'being scarcely ever asked, and never attended to,' so, after that event, made him into a sort of political hermit. It was, at all events, the kind of character than which none could be more unsuitable to a political leader.

It may indeed be objected that a man can be scarcely reckoned among unpractical men, who always effected that which he attempted; who harangued against the American War, and

helped to crush the Cabinet which supported it; who led the onslaught upon pensions and places, and curtailed that form of bribery; who took up the cause of India in a scornful, neglectful House of Commons, and made them take up that cause as their own; who, lastly, when repudiated by his old friends, could teach them that, 'if his support was of no account, his hostility was to be dreaded, for that he held their political fortunes in his possession, and was to strike a blow from which the party would not recover for more than a generation.' But success is not always a proof of practical abilities. These are shown, not so much by the energy of an onslaught upon hostile views, as by the use made of opportunities, and the power, in new circumstances, of maintaining the same relation to old friends. Burke was right in his dislike of the excesses of the French reformers, but wrong in that he manifested his aversion, not by carrying his party along with him in condemning, as a party, these excesses, but by passing over in spirit, as well as in fact, and 'squeezing himself in between Pitt and Dundas,' at the head of the English Conservatives. When he did this, he did in effect retire from active political life, as the Whig newspaper organs, in their insolent way, gave out. Henceforth he only did in Parliament what he might have accomplished as well out, viz. deliver eloquent and often profound essays. The very fact, mentioned by his latest biographer, as though to demonstrate his influence as a practical statesman, that 'no great debate passes now without Burke being appealed to as the most unexceptionable authority by one side or the other, and generally by both sides,' proves too much, indicating his true position as being, perhaps, above both parties, but certainly not at the head of either.

That his contemporaries should not have clearly recognised his isolated grandeur, while acutely detecting his impracticability as a leader, was to be expected. Mr. Macknight accounts it a gross crime. Literary men are rather too fond of assuming that it is the bounden duty of all of practical abilities to bow down to those who can accomplish results only in the future. Fox was but little of a philosopher, and perhaps still less of a literary man. Pitt has left no works behind him but the great one of the national debt; and, consequently, when the latter came into collision with Burke on the matter of Sir Elijah Impey, we are told that such conduct was 'unbecoming in one who was so much the inferior in years, in attainments, and in genius,' while Fox's opposition to a tone which seemed to compromise English liberalism is denounced as obviously inconsistent with his former generous assertion that he had learnt more from Burke than from all the books he ever read; and he is

held up to reprobation as clearly the aggressor in an indefensible quarrel. We do not see this. Some great men's greatness produces its fruits at once, and that of others ripens more slowly. Let both have their proportionate praise and rank. It is unfair for those who are to reap innumerable harvests of fame and sympathy in futurity, to require homage from the men who can give their age but one impulse, and then are gone.

While Lord Rockingham lived, the defects of Burke's political character were not very apparent. He was able—no one better—to spy out a weakness in the adversary's arguments, and point an attack; and his deference for his great and docile patron made him submit readily to the directions furnished by that nobleman's characteristic caution as to the proper time and objects for the onslaught. He never learned that for one object he should not sacrifice all others; but, during that earlier period, he acquiesced in such views when taken by his colleagues. Subsequently, when emancipated from patrons, and independent, he acted as though everything ought to be neglected and thrown aside till the one topic of his mind was thoroughly exhausted. Considerateness for the accused, during the prosecution of Hastings, he regarded as sympathy with his imputed crimes; and, with his imagination and passions kindled almost into frenzy by the reflection in his mind of the extravagances of the French Revolution, he wrote and spoke in a way to justify the charge of Francis, that 'it was 'easy to pity the sufferings of individuals, but no tears were 'shed for nations;' or Fox's retort upon him of an expression used by himself in the interest of our revolted colonies, 'I 'do not know how to draw up a bill of indictment against a 'whole people.' We must repeat, that his error as a politician lay, not in the fact that he ever consciously, if sometimes unconsciously, said what was false, or disguised the truth; but that he did not care to temper one conviction of his mind with another, but now threw his whole weight into the one scale, now into the other. We who have before us his whole career as a statesman, can see that he was never, or very rarely, in sentiment inconsistent, for that one impulse of aversion for tyranny balanced another impulse of loathing for a raw fervour of innovation. His contemporaries may be pardoned for not laboriously weighing against a furious burst of invective against the one an equally violent assault upon the other.

It is a rather ungrateful task to attempt to discover in so grand a statesman's own temperament a reason for his own personal insignificance in the midst of the triumph of his tenets and schemes. It is ungrateful, not merely because it appears to imply a depreciation of this wonderful genius, but

still more as liable to be regarded as a defence of the parties which, at the same time, profited by and maltreated him. We have endeavoured to show why it was that his companions dared to spurn and ridicule his counsels; but the explanation of the cause is no apology for the fact. Those hootings and obstinate determination to hear nothing opposed to their own favourite dogmas, are a disgrace upon not only the Whig interest, but the House of Commons as a deliberative assembly.

The same intemperateness which made him, while so farsighted in perceiving objects at any distance in a straight line, utterly incapable of reconnoitring the circumjacent circumstances, followed him into private life. The death of an only son almost deprived him of reason; and the love of splendour and good taste made him, for rearing a mansion with 'beautiful wings and stately colonnades,' accumulate debts the discharging of which tasked and occupied the residue of his widow's days, and forced the overthrow of pension-lists to receive thankfully part of the royal or national bounty. It need scarcely be said that we see no crime in Burke's accepting of this favour at the hands of the ministers; yet it is unpleasant to find that this unselfish patriot put himself by uncalled-for extravagance into an apparently equivocal position: and we must protest against Mr. Macknight's argument, that they have no right to accuse Burke of prodigality who can see nothing in Hastings' pecuniary transactions to blame. The expenses of Hastings' trial were forced upon him; but surely the free hospitality and magnificence of Beaconsfield were voluntary luxuries on the part of his great accuser.

Yet Burke, such as he was, will always be reckoned, whether from the potentiality of his genius or the actual effects produced by him, among the really great men of Europe. He in England, and Washington in America, have set their mark ineffaceably upon the eighteenth century. Nevertheless, the results which were mainly due to their exertions in neither case seem to have been in exact accordance with the general tenour of their author's temperament. Burke was surely an ardent lover of his country's greatness; but it was his eloquent voice which, by pleading against the advocates for the justice of the colonial war, damped the national enthusiasm, gave the sympathies of half the land to the insurgents, and so made eventual success hopeless; for who can suppose that, however just the revolutionary cause, had Great Britain determined to conquer, it could not have done so? He was equally a friend of liberty; yet his passionate denunciations revived Toryism, and were appealed to, most undeservedly it is true, as authorities for tyranny by all the despots of Europe. Washington, on the contrary, was by birth and con-

nexions, by antecedents, and, still more, by disposition, a Conservative, a born friend of aristocracy, and hater of democracy. Further, he disliked theory, and seemed to understand only the practical bearing of measures. Yet to him almost exclusively the United States are indebted for the triumph of their Revolution, and the favourers of revolution for a proof of the practicability of schemes, however apparently desperate. But with the analogy of the contrast in both between their tone of feeling and the policy, of effectuating which they were the chief instruments, the resemblance between them stops. The Englishman—for it is impossible to think of Burke as an Irishman—was never the agent in carrying out the plans which he made triumph. He persuaded practical men of their practicability; and his pupils, now a Fox and now a Pitt, brought them into operation. He ever held himself out as a man of action; but his activity seldom ever extended beyond words. He controlled opinion, but not votes. The American leader propounded no theories; but he gave to ideas form and substance. Men learnt what were his thoughts only from his deeds. Other men's words explain their life; his life was its own interpreter. About a man of this type every contemporary record and reminiscence possesses an inestimable value. We are interested in minute particulars respecting Burke. It is pleasant to hear of his efforts at farming, of his reproof of the condemnation of indiscriminate charity, because its broken-down object might spend the alms in gin—'if gin will give him comfort, let him have gin;' but it is only, after all, the objectless curiosity, which dwells eagerly on every detail about those we admire, and whom we already have thoroughly scanned, which is gratified. It is like the pleasure at dwelling on every feature of a scene we can see any day we please, as compared with the very different sentiment of a man planning emigration, looking at a photograph of an Australian prairie. In Burke's works we have all the essential materials for a complete insight into his character. Every detail of his private domestic life and habits is only useful as corroborating a foregone conclusion. If those furnished in a biography were opposed to the clear inferences derived from his works, the reader would be inclined rather to put the stories on one side as untrue, or as capable, were the circumstances fully narrated, of bearing a different construction, than to abandon in their favour the conclusion already come to. But Washington's character is to be translated, as it were, entirely out of the cipher of his actions; and as no interpretation of hieroglyphics can be accepted which is completely irreconcilable with one inscription in the same character, every portion of his life requires to be held up to the closest scrutiny.

One of the most striking characteristics of this great man is his entire absence of resemblance to the majority of his countrymen. These *Recollections* of him by his adopted son, while suggesting most vividly his character, themselves contain most terrible evidence of the tawdry love of the stilted and mock-poetic which has so long been the besetting sin of American literature. Why should all American authors, with but two or three undoubted exceptions, harangue on the topics of everyday life in the style of Choctaws in their war paint? As the beautiful Melusine, in the fairy tale, had to atone for her unnatural exchange of her original form for feminine loveliness, by re-assuming, on periodical occasions, her hereditary snakehood, is the national genius of the New World doomed to expiate its precocious practical-mindedness, its propensity for wooden nutmegs, and such pleasant exuberances of a trafficking enthusiasm, by reverting in its literature to the petty pomposities of the aborigines of its backwoods? Two exceptions there certainly are to this rule of majestic trifling—Irrving and Longfellow. We might have supposed that the precociousness of the national hero in the first case, and the circumstance of having inhabited the general's quarters at Cambridge in the second, had protected them from the pervading infection, but for the inauspicious appearance of the plague-marks thick on the effusions of Washington's own child by adoption and education.

The reader of this otherwise interesting volume is again and again nauseated by romantic garnishings of a really heroic career. We cannot get through twenty pages without being informed of some apocryphal Indian chief's declaration, that 'the Great Spirit protected that man, that he might become the chief of nations,' or being told that he was 'Pater Patriæ,' and also 'first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen.' The following episode in the boyhood of Washington may be quoted, both as instancing his firm courage—from the first, and as a fair sample of the diction of the book:—'One colt there was, a sorrel, destined to be as famous (?), and for much better reason, as the horse which the brutal emperor raised to the dignity of consul. This sorrel was of fierce, ungovernable nature, and resisted all attempts to subject him to the rein. He had reached his fullest size and vigour unconscious of a rider; he ranged free in the air which he snuffed in triumph, tossing his mane to the winds, and spurning the earth in the pride of his freedom. It was a matter of common remark that a man never would be found hardy enough to back and ride this vicious horse. Several had essayed, but, deterred by the fury of the animal, they had desisted from their attempts, and the steed remained unbroken. The young Washington pro-

'posed to his companions, that if they would assist him in
 'confining the steed, so that a bridle could be placed in his
 'mouth, he would engage to ride this terror of the parish.
 'Accordingly, early the ensuing morning, the associates decoyed
 'the horse into an inclosure, where they secured him, and
 'forced a bit into his mouth. Bold, vigorous, and young, the
 'daring rider sprang to his unenvied seat, and bidding his
 'comrades remove their tackle, the indignant courser rushed to
 'the plain. As if disdaining his burden, he at first attempted
 'to fly; but soon felt the power of an arm which could have
 'turned his Arab grandsires in their wildest courses on their
 'native deserts. The struggle now became terrific to the be-
 'holders. But the youthful hero, that "Spirit-protected man,"
 'clung to the furious steed, till, centaur-like, he appeared to
 'make part of the animal itself. Long was the conflict; and the
 'fears of the associates became more relieved as, with matchless
 'skill, the rider preserved his seat, and with unyielding force
 'controlled the courser's rage, when the gallant horse, summon-
 'ing all his powers to one mighty effort, reared and plunged
 'with tremendous violence, burst his noble heart, and died in an
 'instant.' We further learn, in various places, that Wash-
 'ington's mother, 'the Mother of Romans,' 'who first bent the
 'twig to incline the tree to glory,' 'was made of sterner stuff
 'than to be moved by all the pride that glory ever gave, and
 'all the pomp and circumstance of power;' that 'the modern
 'Cincinnatus' 'gave to liberty's drooping eagles a renewed and
 'bolder flight, when a mercenary foe aimed against him the
 'fatal blow;' that, 'on seeing his commander standing amidst
 'a roar of musketry, alive, unharmed, and without a wound,
 'his aid, a gallant and warm-hearted son of Erin, a man
 'of thews and sinews, and albeit unused to the melting mood,
 'wept like a child for joy;' that when he went to bed, he was
 'visited, not by plain sleep, but by 'tired nature's sweet restorer,
 'balmy sleep;' that 'his physiognomy did not in its type express
 'the reckless ambition of the broad-fronted Cæsar, or the
 'luxurious indulgence of the curled Anthony, but rather the
 'better age of Rome, the Fabius Maximus, Marcellus, or the
 'Scipios; that, in short, he had a form upon which every god
 'did seem to set his seal, to give the world assurance of a man;' that when he was a few minutes behind his time, 'twas strange, 'twas passing strange; and that the Father of his Country's epoch was 'the awful period that tried men's souls.' But it is useless attempting to give the reader a conception of the inflation of style in this volume; for in every page—nay, almost in every line—we see, as it were, the writer's intellect and fancy poised upon tiptoe, trying, it may be imagined, to look over into a

vessel of certainly very disproportionate dimensions to his adopted son's genius. The ludicrousness of this vast expenditure of rhetoric is made the more manifest by the conspicuous reserve and simplicity of character in the subject of its 'Recollections,' which it is their great merit to have especially brought to light and displayed. In a life of Patrick Henry, of Jefferson, or of Webster, we have no right to be startled at finding the *Æneid* or *Pharsalia* done into English blank verse, with the divisions of the lines not marked, and the title of Biography prefixed; but *à priori* one might have hoped to have had memorials of Washington at least treated as sacred ground, not to be desecrated by plaster monuments to the eloquence of their preserver or compiler.

It is pleasant to find that, in this nation of talkers, Washington was distinguished, even in his youth, when he sat in the Pre-revolutionary House of Burgesses, as a silent rather than a speaking member. But even much more minute particulars have a significance as respects this great character. The regularity of his taste, even at a luxurious Virginian breakfast-table, when he always chose simply Indian cakes, honey, and tea; the veracity in all his dealings, which made the brand 'George Washington' exempt a barrel of flour from the customary inspection in the West India ports; the invariable toast, 'All our friends,' after dinner; his honest exactness in doing a day's work in the day, his love of domestic social conversation, his cheerful piety, the Sunday readings of old-fashioned standard English divines, the frequent walk to his watchmaker when in Philadelphia to regulate his watch, the moving of the lips and raising of the hand, marking meditations very different from the scene around him; even the kindly grasp of a coachmaker's hand by the President of a great nation, and the ever-thoughtful care for his old servants and soldiers; the otherwise most trifling details, of which this volume has certainly its full share, all borrow dignity from their subject, and are as interesting as the greatest events in the lives of ordinary statesmen.

The 'Recollections' embrace all the four divisions of Washington's life—his career previous to the War of Independence, the war itself, his demeanour as President, and finally, his happy retirement till his death, full of years, honours, and love, at Mount Vernon. Many most interesting particulars—interesting spite of the air of burlesque spread over them by the author's ambitious ultra-Homeric style—are narrated about the earliest of these times; but Sparkes and Washington Irving have already culled most of the flowers. In the second period we discover everywhere suggestions for a confutation of the popular de-

preciation of Washington's generalship. It has been the habit to represent him as accomplishing everything, as it were, by the perfection of his moral character, or through the miserable mismanagement of the British. It is very true that, without assistance from the latter cause, the germ of a nation like the American colonies could not have wrenched themselves free from a great empire such as ours; but it was not at all so sufficiently greater in extent than the gross incapacity of many of the colonial commander's dictators in Congress, and his coadjutors elsewhere, as to explain the final result without the recognition, as essential in accomplishing this, of the genius of Washington himself. Lord Stanhope, in the narrative of these events contained in his most judicious history, appears to find, in the conduct at home of Lord North and Lord George Germaine and their fellow-ministers, a full reason for the issue. He praises Washington's noble nature—as who must not?—but he never sees the great general. Yet, if not mere success (a test which would surely insure the Virginian's name a triumph), but rather the power of making all circumstances favour his schemes, of never losing an opportunity, often creating one, show generalship, the world has never beheld his superior. A very contrary belief has, strange to say, obtained advocates, not only in Europe, but in America. Even Jefferson declared that his extreme caution was better adapted for the methodical operations of a siege than for the more energetic displays of a pitched battle. We rather think that contemporaries, in some measure rivals, were scarcely fair judges of his powers; and that Mr. Parke Custis's partiality has carried him rather nearer the truth, notwithstanding his copious discharge of notes of interrogations: 'Did not this modern Fabius,' he writes, 'in the very depth of winter, and after overcoming mighty obstacles, surprise his enemy at Trenton, and recall victory to his standard, when hope was almost sinking in despair? Did he not, by a masterly manœuvre, and midnight march, surprise his enemy in Princeton and add yet another laurel to that already acquired by the capture of the Hessians? Did he not, with an army hastily raised, and defeated at Brandywine, in twenty-three days thereafter, surprise the enemy at Germantown? And though victory was denied him by a force of circumstances no human power could have controlled, yet the boldness of the enterprise, and the success attending it in the outset, produced such a confidence abroad in our courage and resources as to lead to our alliance with a powerful nation. Did he not surprise the enemy at Monmouth? And, although untoward events seemed to cripple the operations of the early part of the day, yet the setting sun shone upon the battle-field

‘in possession of the Americans, the enemy retreating, and their dead and wounded left as trophies to the victors. Such were the memorable instances in which Washington, with troops newly raised, and badly provided with every necessary of war, struck at his veteran and well-appointed foe when least expected, producing the happiest influences upon the American cause both at home and abroad.’

The high authority of Jefferson has pronounced, that ‘his heart was not warm in its affections;’ and with that judgment the world in general seems readily to have concurred; yet with perhaps still less reason. He was reserved to the many from habit, and ‘stern,’ it is rightly said, ‘to all whom he deemed wanting in those high moral requisites which dignify and adorn our nature. Stern he was to the disturbers of the repose of society, the violaters of those institutions which promote peace and good-will among men,’ and could wither up with a glance impertinents like Governor Morris, who, for a bet, accosted the General with a rudely jocular slap on the shoulder; but there his austerity ended. If the jealous politicians of Congress could not always fairly estimate either his martial genius or his ready benevolence, at all events his soldiers and officers, all at least but his rivals, could and did thoroughly. To them his patience was not insensibility, and his coolness not coldness. When his aide-de-camp, Colonel Fitzgerald, cried for joy, at finding him escape uninjured from a desperate and triumphant effort to rally his men at Princeton, the reply by a brief order to do his duty and bring up the troops was not thought sullenness; nor again, when Hamilton, in his rage at General Lee’s apparent treachery, leaping from his horse, proposed to make a forlorn attack on the enemy, was the calm command to him, to obey orders and mount till he was bid dismount, regarded by its impetuous object as a piece of unkindly irony against enthusiasm. On one occasion, described in this volume, when the troops were wearily plodding to their winter-quarters at Valley Forge, Washington’s approach was announced. As he rode slowly up, he was observed to be eyeing very earnestly the frozen surface of the ground. He bade the commanding-officer come to him, and addressed him as follows: ‘How comes it, sir, that I have tracked the march of your troops by the blood-stains of their feet?’ The officer’s reply was, that it was his regiment’s misfortune to be among the last to be served; and the stores became exhausted before their turn came. ‘The general was observed to be deeply affected by this description. His compressed lips, the heaving of his chest, betokened the powerful emotions that were struggling in his bosom, when, turning towards the troops,

‘with a voice tremulous yet friendly, he exclaimed, “Poor fellows!” then, giving rein to his charger, rode away. During this touching interview, every eye was bent upon the chief, every ear was attentive to catch his words; and when those words reached the soldiers, a grateful but subdued expression burst from every lip of “God bless your excellency, your poor soldiers’ friend!”’ When a man’s acts are always benevolent, it is wonderful how few words are needed to interpret them clearly enough. Congress was always voting studied panegyrics, but seldom sending shoes and pork; and thus the army was ever ready to convert the selfish panegyrical Speaker’s mace into a royal sceptre for the taciturn, laborious commander.

His officers had the same feeling. His subordinate generals might, in the glow of their occasional triumphs, be tempted into caballing and sneering; but, in the day of reverse and general outcries, even a Horatio Gates turned, not in vain, to the justice of the man he had sought to supplant for protection. The account of Washington’s demeanour, on hearing the news of General St. Clair’s surprise in Ohio, by the Indians, lightens up, as by a sudden flash, the mysterious depths of his profound character, both bringing into relief the justice and fairness which made his soldiers and his often-murmuring officers rely on him in adversity; and also showing that the apparent equability of his temper was a carefully trained and fostered virtue, not a defect of nature. It was while at dinner on a winter’s day, that he was called out to read the despatch. He soon returned, apologized for his absence, and attended to his wife’s evening visitors with his customary courtesy. At last, he was left alone with his secretary, Mr. Lear. For some minutes, he walked up and down in silence; at length: “Yes,” he burst forth, “here, on this very spot, I took leave of him; I wished him success and honour. I said, ‘I will add but one word: beware of a surprise.’ He went off with that as my last solemn warning thrown into his ears. And yet, to suffer that army to be cut to pieces, hacked by a surprise—the very thing I guarded him against! O God, O God! he is worse than a murderer! How can he answer it to his country? The blood of the slain is upon him—the curse of widows and orphans!” This torrent came out in tone appalling. His very frame shook. He sat down on the sofa once more. He was silent. He at length said, in an altered voice, “This must not go beyond this room.” Another pause followed—a longer one—when he said, in a tone quite low. “General St. Clair shall have justice. I will hear him without prejudice; he shall have full justice.” And from Washington St. Clair

had justice. 'The unfortunate general, worn down by age, disease, and the hardships of a frontier campaign—assailed by the press, and with the current of popular opinion setting hard against him—repaired to his chief, as to a shelter from the fury of so many elements. Washington extended his hand to one who appeared in no new character; for, during the whole of a long life, misfortune seemed "to have marked him for her own." Poor old St. Clair hobbled up, seized the offered hand in both of his, and gave vent to his feelings in an audible manner. He was subsequently tried by a commission of Government, and proved to have been *unfortunate*.' The world, in this case, and probably in many others, only witnessed the results of Washington's deliberation; it was merely by an accident that we know of how severe a struggle this generous forbearance to an unsuccessful lieutenant was the issue. Because he so ruled himself as not to run the risk of having to award the slow and altogether inadequate compensation of an apology through prejudging an imputed offence, men who saw no manifestation of indignation inferred that he felt none. On the contrary, those who knew him well have allowed that he was naturally of a quick and violent temper, nobly controlled. Perhaps only on one occasion was it suffered to run its course freely. After the war, a friend of General Scott, whose every other word was an oath, endeavouring to break him of the habit by holding up to him the example of his late commander, asked him if Washington ever swore. 'Scott reflected for a moment, and then exclaimed, "Yes, once. It was at Monmouth, and on a day that would have made any one swear. Yes, sir, he swore on that day till the leaves shook on the trees—charming, delightful! Never have I enjoyed such swearing before or since! Sir, on that ever-memorable day, he swore like an angel from heaven!" It was superfluous to add to this account that the reformer abandoned his friend in despair.

We believe that, even in other matters, Washington's coolness and serenity of deportment has caused some injustice to be done to his very remarkable powers of intellect and knowledge of human character. It is as though his morality had been praised at the expense of his sagacity. The following anecdote about the General's intercourse with Rivington, editor of the *Royal Gazette* at New York, while in the occupation of the king's troops, and a most unscrupulous calumniator of the revolutionary leaders, seems to show that he knew how to avail himself of secret services, and to profit by the corruptibility of humanity. 'When Washington entered New York, on its evacuation by the British forces, he said one morning to two of his officers, "Suppose, gentlemen, we walk down to Rivington's

'book-store; he is said to be a very pleasant kind of a fellow.' 'Amazed as the officers were at the idea of visiting such a man, they of course prepared to accompany the chief. When arrived, Rivington received his visitors with great politeness, for he was, indeed, one of the most elegant gentlemen and best 'bred men of the age;' (and wore curled and powdered hair, claret-coloured coat, scarlet waistcoat, trimmed with gold lace, buckskin breeches, and top-boots). 'Escorting the party into 'a parlour, he begged the officers to be seated, and then said to the chief, "Will your excellency do me the honour to step 'into the adjoining room for a moment, that I may show you a 'list of the agricultural works I am about to order out from 'London for your special use?" They retired. The locks on 'the doors of houses in New York, more than threescore years 'ago, were not so good as now. The door of Rivington's 'private room closed very imperfectly, and soon became ajar, 'when the officers distinctly heard the chinking of two heavy 'purses of gold as they were successively placed on the table.' It is said that Rivington had communicated with Washington by binding his billets in the covers of the books he published. He trusted to selling these to the spies who were ignorant of the special nature of their service, by whom they were sure to be conveyed to Washington's head-quarters.

We wonder what the same depreciators of the General's readiness and acuteness at the head of an army will think of the following anecdote:—

'The bearer of one despatch was a young man named 'Montagnie, who was directed by Washington to cross the river 'at King's Ferry, proceed by Haverstraw to the Ramapo Clove, 'and through the pass to Morristown. Montagnie, knowing the 'Ramapo Pass to be in possession of the friends of the enemy, 'ventured to suggest to the commander-in-chief that the upper 'road would be the safest. "I shall be taken," he said, "if I 'go through the Clove." "Your duty, young man, is not to 'talk, but to obey!" replied Washington sternly, enforcing 'his words by a vigorous stamp of his foot. Montagnie pro- 'ceeded as directed, and, near the Ramapo Pass, was caught, and 'sent to New York. The day after his arrival, the contents 'of the despatches taken from him were published in '*Rivington's Gazette*, with great parade, for they indicated a 'plan of attack upon the city.'

When they had exhausted their time and preparations, the British and Montagnie learned, at the same time, that meanwhile Washington had had leisure to concert and execute a movement in quite a different direction, and that the messenger's capture was not entirely accidental.

Under the same temperate calmness, which seems to have deceived so many into considering him rather contemptuously as a natural stoic—a passionless man—he sheltered a high and generous moral courage, which, though he was not a man to scorn or outrage public opinion, enabled him on occasion to brave and to shame it. Robert Morris was the great financier of the Revolution. To his courageous confidence in its eventual success it was indebted for the pecuniary supplies which kept its army from perishing. Yet this man, impoverished by land speculations from which Washington had tried to dissuade him, his country suffered to spend the last years of his life in the debtors' prison at Philadelphia. Well may Mr. Custis exclaim: 'For Robert Morris to have been imprisoned *in character*, the bars should have been of gold!' It is a noble reminiscence of Washington, that in 1798, when he came to Philadelphia, as commander-in-chief, to superintend the organization of his last army, unmindful of the pomp which welcomed his arrival, he paid his first visit to the prison-house of Robert Morris. On another occasion, the death of his step-son, who was seized with the camp-fever when attending him as aide-de-camp at Yorktown, his manly grief gives the lie to the accounts which represent him as faultless because all but heartless. It was in the moment of triumph and exultation at the crowning event of the war, the surrender of Earl Cornwallis, when, the tidings having arrived at Philadelphia at night, the watchmen were calling the hours with the suffix, 'and Cornwallis is taken,' that the news that there was no longer hope, reached him. 'The anxious watchers by the couch of the dying were in the grey of the twilight roused by a trampling of horse, and looking out, discovered the commander-in-chief alighting from a jaded charger in the courtyard. To his eager inquiry, "Is there any hope?" the physician mournfully shook his head. The general retired to a room to indulge his grief, requesting to be left alone. In a little while the sufferer expired. Washington, tenderly embracing the bereaved wife and mother, said, "From this moment I adopt his two youngest children as my own." Absorbed in grief, he then waived with his hand a melancholy adieu, and fresh horses being ready, without rest or refreshment, remounted, and returned to the camp thirty miles off.'

Indeed, if ever there was a man who can be taken as an example of the *τετράγωνος ἀνὴρ*, the *four-square* man* of Aristotle, that man was Washington. If his virtues had been the result solely of a passionless calm of temperament, as so many have represented, he would be but a very imperfect

example of the Aristotelian type of complete humanity. The anecdotes given in this volume show, that it was not because he wanted fire in his disposition, that his demeanour was so serene, but because his love of justice, his determination never to condemn, though he captured an offender red-handed, was so entire. He might be taken, we think, far, very far, more fitly, by Mr. Carlyle, than the father of Frederick the Great, to exemplify the dumb-poetic type of humanity, the character which feels and develops the poetry of action and of an energetic life. When we compare this great man with those who co-operated with him in consummating the American Revolution, we perceive yet more vividly both the grandeur and the splendour of his character. There were fine fellows among his officers, like General Nash, who, with thigh shattered by a round shot, and at the point of death, covered his wound with both his hands, and called out gaily to his men, "Never mind me; I have had 'a devil of a tumble! Rush on, my boys, I'll be after you 'presently!'" or, like Morgan, the leader of the Virginian Woodsmen, and hero of the battle of the Cow-pens; but the revolutionary party had not a single general, except Washington, who was more than a brave partisan in a guerilla warfare. Washington was not only a skilful and most accomplished commander-in-chief—though such he must most certainly be esteemed—but he was more; he was a man with an idea of the times, and who could develop his idea in action. More completely even than Cromwell, than William III., or than Mirabeau, in their respective scenes of action, was he the leader and the hero of the Colonial War of Independence. He was not personally their superior, or the equal of the first; but he infinitely more overtopped his contemporaries and rivals. It is but the bare and simple truth to speak of the *necessity* of him to the army, and also to the constitution of America.

Washington in time of peace was, even in the midst of consummate politicians like John Adams, and Jefferson, and Hamilton, as conspicuous and pre-eminent as in war, where he had no rival. What some of his countrymen have accounted defects in his habits enlarged his efficiency. His old Virginian aristocratic tone of feeling and manners for instance, prevented the people from missing the pomp and ceremonial of the former royal governors, and sustained in the upper classes that interest in the government of their country, the disappearance of which in more modern times is so dangerous and ruinous a feature in the United States. It is not, in fact, quite accurate to say, as does Mr. Custis, that 'there never lived a man more averse to show and pomp than Washington.' There was, assuredly, never any

one with less of vanity ; but some little show his early associations and reminiscences of the old state of things in Virginia made seem to his mind part of the decencies and proprieties of high station even in a republic. That he had not lost 'the genteel taste for fine cloathes,' as Walton expresses it in speaking of George Herbert, which marks his commissions to his London agents before the war ; or for fine equipages, as when, in the precincts of the vice-regal court at Williamsburgh, in the days of the old *régime*, Colonel Washington's bays vied with Colonel Byrd's greys, is abundantly proved by the cream-coloured English coach, with panels painted by Cipriani, with groups of the Seasons, and its six shining bay horses, which was one of the sights of Philadelphia ; and the purple satin dress, or rich black velvet, with diamond knee-buckles, scrupulously japanned shoes and buckles, ruffles, powder, bag, and dress-sword of his presidential days ; all being adorned by a manner most courteous without being formal, a singularly attractive smile, eyes which could flash and glow on occasion, and an expression of countenance, grave, but not stern, which no painter could catch, and by a form declared by Lafayette to be the most superb he had ever beheld. The internal arrangements of his household were all decorous and dignified. There was no useless parade or expense : he always himself scrupulously inspected his weekly accounts ; but there was, at the same time, nothing sordid ; and though not of a disposition to diminish needlessly his patrimony, he freely spent the produce of the sale of a very considerable estate to eke out the state salary. We find amusingly described in the 'Recollections' the awful neatness of the President's stables : the horses enveloped, the night before they were to be ridden, in a white paste ; the ostlers hard at work rubbing this off before dawn ; the overseer with a muslin handkerchief in his hand, on which, when applied to the animals' coats, if the slightest stain were perceptible, down came the whip : then Fraunces, the steward of magnificent ideas, who, to reproaches on the score of waste, would reply with tears and the exclamation, "He may kill me if he will ; but while he 'is president, and I have the honour to be his steward, 'his establishment shall have the best of everything,'" even the solitary shad of the season, at three dollars the fish, though the master's indignation at the cost might consign the luxury to the servants' hall ; and Uncle Harkless, the chief cook, sauntering with the dandies up Market Street, in silk, with cocked hat and gold-headed cane, to glorify the presidential establishment.

Washington knew how to preserve simplicity of manner and thought amid some magnificence of living. Some few might

murmur at, for instance, his *levées* and his wife's drawing-rooms as verging on monarchical etiquette and formality ; but on the whole the nation approved and liked to have a chief who could live like a prince, and feel and talk like a citizen among citizens. The voluntary celebration of his birthday by a ball in every great town showed that the endurance of Presidential ceremonies was not deemed by republican America a forced discharge of the debt of gratitude due to its great liberator.

Perhaps the most interesting portions of the book are the accounts of Washington at Mount Vernon, when released from the command of the army, and, at length, from the cares of civil office. A part of each day was always set apart for meditation and devotion ; nor this in time of peace only ; for we are told that 'one day, while the Americans were encamped at Valley Forge, the owner of the house occupied by the General, a Quaker, strolled up the creek, and, when not far from his mill, heard a solemn voice. He walked quietly in the direction of it, and saw Washington's horse tied to a sapling. In a thicket near by was the chief, upon his knees in prayer, his cheeks suffused with tears.' He rose generally about four: the library, and a visit to the stables, occupied the time till breakfast ; and then he regularly every day made the tour of his farms, without attendants, opening his gates, pulling down and pulling up his fences as he passed, with compass in hand, and in his plain drab clothes, broad-brimmed white hat, with a hickory switch and umbrella with long staff attached to his saddle-bow, the ideal of a gentleman farmer, who did all things, from the inauguration of a constitution to the planting of a tobacco-field, with his whole heart and soul. Precisely at a quarter to three, his horse's hoofs were heard approaching the door, for whether it were the pit of a theatre, or Congress, a band of expectant maidens with laurel wreaths, or a British army, or even a cook, Washington never kept any one waiting. At three, dinner was served : a late guest had only to make apologies to himself ; and after four or five glasses of Madeira, the host retired to write letters in his library, rejoining his family at tea, whence, after much talk and reading aloud of newspapers, at nine he went off to bed. His great delight after his retirement was in improving his Mount Vernon estate, where he was his own architect and surveyor. His correspondence with men like Sir John Sinclair and Arthur Young was minute and extensive ; and the most acceptable presents to the ex-President from American statesmen or foreign sovereigns were animals of a good breed, or specimens of useful plants and trees. Nor, while attending to the decoration of his mansion and grounds, laying out deer-parks (which, by-the-by, supplied the neighbourhood with venison, while the owner's love

of his game denied the Mount Vernon table a single haunch), and paving colonnades with foreign marbles, was he careless of his servants' comfort. He took care that he got from them a fair day's work, but he felt that property had its reciprocal duties. Within certain limits he even considered them free to do, if they chose, what he himself most strongly disapproved, as a copy, in his handwriting, of a contract between a drunken gardener and himself quaintly demonstrates. It was therein agreed, that Philip Barter, for the considerations therein mentioned, was not at any time to suffer himself to be 'disguised with liquor, except on times thereafter mentioned;' that is to say, that the said George Washington was, among other things, to pay him 'four dollars at Christmas, with which he may be 'drunk four days and four nights; two dollars at Easter to 'effect the same purpose; two dollars at Whitsuntide to be 'drunk for two days.'

It is not unusual to intimate that Washington's character was not so portentous a phenomenon in the America of his day as it seems now; that Virginia, at all events, could have furnished many examples of a like English gentlemanly simplicity; and this seems to be supposed in the frequent lamentations of Americans, that 'the aspect of Congress in those old times was 'very different from what we now witness. There was an air 'of decorum, of composure, of reflection, of gentlemanly and 'polished dignity, which has fled, or lingers only with here and 'there a relic of the olden time.' We can hardly think so. A careful consideration of the characters of really great men like Patrick Henry and Jefferson, the leaders of the old Congress, and the Randolphs and Peytons, who predominated in the Virginian Assembly, scarcely bears out an inference that Washington's pre-eminence was merely in degree. These men certainly could emulate, though not, perhaps, surpass him, in the good taste of their equipages, and the splendour of their entertainments; but we find just the same sort of exaggeration, verging close upon the ludicrous, in their deportment and oratory, as in that of their modern successors. It has been said of Washington, that he was always the same; that even in his social hours his friends felt for him a certain veneration and awe. This was not the result of a perpetual stiffness and inflexibility of mien (which certainly does not tend to win respect); for he could walk a minuet in the days of his glory with complaisance, and in his youth with rapture; and amidst the cares of state, find time to chide a schoolboy for idling, and admonish smilingly a coquette. It flowed rather from what is justly described as 'the strongest, most ever-present sense of propriety that ever

‘human being possessed, impressing the observer with a conviction that he was exactly and fully equal to what he had to do.’ It was just this admirable power of proportioning, not merely the action, but even the thought and the feeling to the occasion, which distinguishes him from his otherwise great contemporaries. ‘He was the only man,’ said Lord Erskine of him, ‘whose character he could not contemplate without awe and wonder.’ We believe that the judgment of posterity will not vary from this, and that if any man could have, he had a right, when dying, to exclaim, as he did, ‘I am dying, but am not afraid to die !’

ART. IV.—*Life and Letters of John Angell James.* Nisbet.

JOHN ANGELL JAMES has been so long a name in the Non-conformist world, and as an acknowledged leader he took so conspicuous a part in the popular religious movements of a long and busy period, that we make no apology for introducing his biography to our readers, especially as his biographer and eulogist has shown himself very well equal to his task. Of course we expect enthusiasm for his subject, and a strong bias for Congregationalism from Mr. James's friend, colleague, and eventual successor; but he has compiled a book full of information not only for the Society to which, as far as there is any cohesion in it, he belongs, but also for all who are interested in the history of popular religion and its various developments. For this general purpose, probably, no better central figure could have been chosen than Angell James, from the long period in which he occupied a prominent place, from his influence with his party in England and America, from his practical powers and spirit of ascendancy adapting him to take the lead, and also from the weight of his private character and unusually consistent career. Though not seldom engaged in active opposition and controversy with 'the Establishment,' he became from these causes an authority with the Low-Church party, and many of those movements which, on the plea of a more general and 'Catholic' unity, led the clergy to coalesce with Dissenters, and to separate themselves in the same proportion from their own brethren, have their origin in him. The meetings for united prayer, where, in our large towns, clergy and dissenting ministers pray by turns and acknowledge no difference in calling or authority, began under his auspices. With him originated the first idea of the Evangelical Alliance, from the first minutes of which, as a matter of avowed expediency rather than principle, he thought it wise to exclude any formal protest against prelacy, saying, 'If we take up the latter' (antagonism to prelacy) 'we cannot carry Episcopalians with us;' adding, however, 'not, indeed, that I expect any disposition 'on their part, or, at least, the bulk of them, to confederate.'

He laboured strenuously in the cause of Revivals, catching the enthusiasm from his American brethren, and in connexion

with this movement wrote his principal work, 'The Anxious Inquirer,' a little book as popular with the Low-Church school as with Dissenters, and based on disbelief in the Church doctrine concerning baptism. The method and steadiness of his personal character enabled him to wield these various engines of religious excitement with a discretion which inspired confidence. If the principles of the religion and the party to which he belonged, naturally lead to extremes, his own nature was averse to them, or rather, he had a caution always at work in spite of himself, which held him in check, and would have made extravagances of any sort sit uneasy upon him. He was one of the men to make the best of the circumstances in which he was placed, but not to see his way out of them. Circumstances in his case made him a Nonconformist, and he accepted the position, as it seems, without having once been disturbed by a moment's doubt. Religion and society, from his earliest boyhood, must have been regarded from the Dissenting point of view, and he received without a question the traditions of this school. Thus he had no tendency to schism; his loyalty to the party in which he found himself may imply, perhaps, at least an equal loyalty had he been born and bred a son of the Church; and his essentially practical mind led him naturally rather to turn what he possessed to use, than to investigate its grounds, or doubt its value or completeness. The particulars of his early life explain much of his subsequent career.

His father was a linen-draper, of Blandford Forum, in Dorsetshire, of an old though obscure family, with a roll of 'pious progenitors' going two hundred years back, to whom were attached traditions of persecution and trial for conscience' sake. Both his father and mother inherited Dissent. His father he speaks of as a common-place character, punctual in his place at meeting, but more occupied in his business, especially in the manufacture of buttons, than in the assertion of his religious convictions, except where both these interests met; as when he found himself in London on Good Friday, and wrote—'Yesterday, being called Good Friday, of course no business was done, so that I may reckon a day lost.' His mother was more earnest in her religion; the son calls her a good, but not a great woman, which is a grandiloquent way of saying that she had more feeling than sense. She had been brought up a Baptist, which accounts for his not being baptized till near his ordination. He describes her as so fervent in prayer that she could be heard far beyond the precincts of her closet; a practice in which he owns to have followed her example, incurring much ridicule thereby, till experience taught more reserve. One of these fervent prayers the mother pronounced over her son in infancy, which he

ever after remembered, and to which he traced his subsequent course. Beyond this his parents do not seem to have occupied themselves much with his religious training; at eight years old he was sent for two years to a rough village boarding-school to learn reading and arithmetic, and here, perhaps for the only time of his life, he went to church; but his companions were disorderly, he learnt to swear, applied himself more to fighting than his lessons, and seems in after-life to have associated all together as a season of irreligion. He was next put under an Arian preacher, where he learnt a little Latin. That it was not more, he ever after regretted, feeling very acutely in after years the deficiencies of his early education; but in boyhood he had no taste for learning, and was always getting into scrapes, so that his mother acknowledged to a neighbour that 'her son John was her chief trouble,' though, probably, he manifested no real ill disposition, as her friend consoled her with the argument that as he was clever at play the boy 'would do well enough by and by.' In due time his father apprenticed him to a linen-draper, with 'a member of the Independent Church, at Poole,' a professor, but hardly acting up to his profession. Respect for his mother, he tells us, preserved him from open irreligion; he regularly attended meeting, and listened to high Calvinism, interspersed with anecdotes, from a disciple of Whitfield. Calvinism, we presume, if anything, is the essential creed of Congregationalists, who used to be popularly called Calvinists, and in theory Angell James always avowed himself a follower of Calvin, but it never quite commended itself to his practical mind, or mixed much in his preaching. At the close of the volume occurs a passage on this head:—

'At a time when there was a great deal of talk about the supposed decline of orthodoxy among the younger ministers, Mr. James, in conversation with a young minister, was expressing the apprehensions which he often uttered in public; his companion, who thought his apprehensions groundless, and saw that he was in a desponding mood, looked up and said, rather mischievously, "Well, Mr. James, you know that I am more orthodox than you are."

"What! what!" was his reply, with a puzzled and amused look; "how do you make that out?"

"At least I am more Calvinistic than you."

"No, sir," said Mr. James, raising his closed hand to give emphasis to his words; "I hold the doctrines of Calvinism with a firm grasp."

"But, sir, you never preach about them, and I do."

"Well," he replied, rather slowly, "there's not so much about them in the Bible."

"That proves what I say, sir," answered the younger minister; "you don't half believe them."

'This conversation, though only half in earnest on one side, indicates Mr. James's real position. In creed he was a moderate Calvinist, belonging to the school of his predecessor, Dr. Williams, but his temperament led him to dwell much more on Christian duty than on Christian privilege.'—Pp. 617, 618.

When about fifteen he describes himself as beginning to feel and to think more of religion, and as praying at intervals; for the practice of daily private prayer seems to have been new to him till a new apprentice came, whom he observed to kneel and say his prayers the night of his arrival. He regarded this young man as sent in answer to his own prayers, accepted him as his guide, and was soon introduced by him to a new teacher, a 'pious cobbler,' who, living in a dirty hovel, and not very clean himself, seems to have possessed some unusual power over the class so few can influence. There Angell James contracted some friendships with young men of his own standing, all seemingly zealous for religion, spending many 'sweet and sacred seasons' together; but whose subsequent career led him to the conclusion that they had never really felt the power of religion, though no experience could have enabled him to decide this, we should say, till after the event. The treatment of the young; the mode in which religion is commended to them; the assumption in them, one and all, of irreligion, till a certain, stated, perfectly recognisable moment, is one of the curious points of this book. Of the three apprentices who began their religious career with Angell James, one died a follower of Tom Paine; another became a 'drunken profligate'; the third, who had brought him to the cobbler, led a wandering unsatisfactory life, and wrote to him at its close, 'that all the time of their acquaintance he 'had been a stranger to the power of true religion.' Angell James was of another mould; his convictions were sincere, and he immediately put into practice what he learnt.

'It will be seen by what I have related that my religious character was a gradual, and not a sudden formation: there was no pungent conviction of sin, no poignancy of godly sorrow, no great and rapid transition of feeling, nor any very clear illumination of knowledge; but there were many evidences of a real change. My delight in prayer was very great; when alone in the shop, when riding in the country on my employer's business, I could not help pouring out my heart to God. In one thing, as I have already said, I was extremely injudicious, and that was, I allowed my feelings so far to get the upper hand of my judgment as to pray so loud, that though I was in the attic, I was heard in the lower parts of the house, and exposed both myself and the exercise I was engaged in to no small degree of ridicule.'—Pp. 34, 35.

With this school there is no interval between religious impressions and the endeavour to influence other minds. No sooner did this youth learn to pray, than his voice is familiar as leading prayer in their prayer-meetings—a voice in his case of such power as no doubt to be felt by all as a sort of call to the only career which would give it full exercise. And very little rest it seems to have had for the sixty years that follow upon its first publicity. We doubt if to such a character mere amusements would ever have possessed much charm. And it

is noticed of him that he could not endure fiction. He was one always to find delight in his work, and naturally to lead in that work. From the time that religion occupied his thoughts, it became also the absorbing business of his life. We do not, therefore, attach much importance to his confessions of declension at this early period, or believe that in eschewing the ordinary diversions of his age, he was overcoming any real temptation.

‘I one time gave occasion to my good friend the shoemaker to grieve over me, by going to an election ball; not that I danced, for I was never taught, but merely went for an hour or two to see what was going on. It was more a matter of curiosity, and of petty vanity at having an opportunity of going to a ball, than any particular taste for such things; but I ought not to have been there. My then present feelings were incompatible with such amusements. My pious friend, who watched over me with a jealous eye, wisely reprovved me, and with such a delicate gentleness as endeared him to my heart. I was also betrayed by curiosity into another inconsistency, and that was to go and see a mimic play, got up by a few young men of the town. While in the room, my conscience so severely reprovved me, that its accusations were like scorpion stings. I was situated under a large beam, and I trembled through my whole frame lest it should fall and crush me to death. As soon as I could, I left the place, and jumped for joy when I found myself safe on the outside of the house. I mention these things to prove that there may be a work of grace going on in the soul when some appearances in young converts would lead us to suspect the reality of the change. Even after the soul is converted to God, it does not see all at once the full extent of its duty. Corruption gets for a little while the upper hand in the struggle.’—P. 33.

He describes himself at this time as courting religious excitement, and encouraging tears, and other outward manifestations of feeling. He became a Sunday-school teacher, which we find does not imply being a ‘professor.’ ‘I never,’ he says, ‘became a professor of religion at Poole, for I was never invited to join ‘in the communion of the Church.’ Put in teaching the children of his class he felt a facility and power, leading him to desire a field of wider usefulness, which naturally developed into a call to the ministry. His father was unwilling at first to sacrifice the sum he had given as premium, but offered no real opposition, and at seventeen he was sent to the Nonconformist College at Gosport.

A great deal is said on the subject of education for the ministry, both in Mr. James’s own words and by the biographer, Mr. Dale. Each is anxious to assert his opinion in favour of a learned ministry, and to impress upon the reader the improvement of modern times upon the old system practised in their colleges.

‘During the last forty years the system of ministerial education among English Congregationalists has undergone a complete transformation; and Mr. James’s account of his life at Gosport, under the care of Dr. Bogue, has all the interest which belongs to a trustworthy narrative of customs now almost

obsolete. Just here and there a few candidates for the ministry are still gathered under the roof of a laborious man, who occupies at the same time the pulpit and the professor's chair, and superintends the reading of his students in the most dissimilar and remote departments of learning; lectures to-day on Original Sin, and to-morrow on Jupiter's Satellites; passes from Xenophon to Homiletics, and from Tacitus to the principles of Church Polity; and the earnestness and ability with which these numerous and conflicting duties are discharged, and the ministerial success of some of the students from these unambitious seminaries, awaken astonishment and admiration. But a new epoch, which Mr. James himself helped to inaugurate, has now begun. Non-conformist colleges are attempting to secure for the ministry a more liberal and learned education than the private academies were able to impart.'—P. 44.

And Mr. James in a mingled strain of humility and self-appreciation which belongs to those who have been successful under difficulties, writes :—

'When I think of the advantages enjoyed by the students of our own times in the present improved system of education in our colleges, and recollect that they have in some cases six years to pursue their studies, I could almost weep to think of my own disadvantages. When I see what men are now presiding over the studies of our colleges, it seems to me as if *now* I could gladly go and sit down at their feet, to repair, at the approaching end of my course, the disadvantages I suffered at the commencement. O favoured students, know, value, improve your privileges! No man has ever been more conscious of his defects than I am of mine. No man ought to have more excuse made for him than myself. It is not surprising that I cannot write in such a pure classic style of elegance as they can who have had a more perfect education. How should I? Yet, through God's most abounding goodness, I have not been idle, or useless, or unknown. I have become an author of works, neither few, nor neglected, nor unblest, written in good plain idiomatic Saxon language; and most of them written but once. To me my career is more wonderful than anything I have ever known; I mean, that one so partially educated, so limited in his attainments, so confined in his knowledge, should have acquired a standing such as has been assigned me in this extraordinary age. Instead of lifting me up with pride, it humbles me in the dust—for, in addition to my original defective education, I have had the disadvantage, as in one respect I may call it, of having been placed in a situation so public, and requiring such constant demands upon me, that I have had little time for reading and study, and for thus making up my original defects.'—Pp. 53, 54.

The man who 'can write in good plain idiomatic Saxon language,' perhaps has no just ground of quarrel with his education. When Mr. James has anything to say, he certainly can say it distinctly; there is a letter of remonstrance on this very subject of education, demanding from the London Missionary Society that they should fulfil their pledges to their students, of giving them something like real education, before sending them to their work, which is most creditable both for feeling and point, and remarkable, as coming from a 'professor of religion,' and addressed to a college of professors, for its perfect freedom from cant and conventional phraseology. In his sermons, Mr. James seems to have been flowery, but his written style no doubt profits by his sense of his own defi-

ciencies. He evidently feels that his safety lies in taking the shortest way to his end. In this, his language forms an agreeable contrast, not with that of his Editor, or his son, both of whom express themselves clearly and unaffectedly, but with some more elaborate specimens of Congregational English. There are quotations from the writings of Mr. Guest, the minister of Taunton, who received his education in Spring Hill College, a seminary embodying all the modern improvements, and to which Mr. James devoted so much time and interest, which conveys a painful idea of effort at fine writing. One sentence begins—

“Desiring to perpetuate the remembrance of the honours that gathered around the obsequies, and to indicate the impression made by them upon a visitor, I devote a page to record the scene.”—P. 528.

In addition to his classical and theological labours, our young student was put at once on the preaching list, and at seventeen went out to preach to village congregations. He never seems to have found any difficulty in this department of his work; and in early life undertook the most arduous duties, without apparently any misgiving. There, again, we see the influence of a voice, which we are convinced sounds in a young preacher's ears like the applause of friends, and staves off importunate fears. He only stayed two years at Gosport, and while yet only nineteen, entered upon the scene of his life-long labours. ‘The congregation worshipping in Carr's Lane, Birmingham,’ were in trouble about their minister, Mr. Brewer, a popular man and powerful preacher, but who had been guilty of some act of immorality, for which the authorities of the meeting-house dismissed him. Brewer went, carrying more than half the congregation with him; and they had a pastor to seek for. Angell James was sent as a ‘supply,’ but made so great an impression, in his first sermon, on his audience, that they almost immediately decided on keeping him amongst them. He had entered upon what was to prove the scene of a life's labours, with an easy confidence in himself, which surprised him in after years.

‘Consequences such as have resulted never rose before my mind. I was going to preach, and that was all. I was but little troubled then, as I have sadly been since, with nervous disorder. I thought less on Saturday night, and slept sounder than I do now when going to preach a Sabbath in a neighbouring town. I am afraid it was not so much the fervour of my piety and the simplicity of my confidence in God, as the thoughtlessness of youth.’—P. 67.

* * * * *

‘I cannot forget the impression produced on my mind by the first view I had of my future flock. The way to the pulpit was from the vestry through a door in the wall, so that I came at once upon the congregation without any preparation. There was no crowd to appal me, for in a place that with one gallery would seat about eight hundred persons, there were probably not more than a hundred and fifty, so that, in this respect, the sight was anything but encou-

raging; but what impressed me was the unusual number, in proportion, of venerable persons. There were nine or ten as respectable elderly gentlemen as are usually collected in a congregation several times the size. It looked like an assembly of the ancients. This a little appalled me, but I do not recollect that it discomposed me.

'My first text was, 1 John iii. 1, 2, "Beloved, now are we the sons of God," &c. First impressions are important to success, and those, I believe, were decidedly in my favour. The subject was interesting, and as it was a sermon I had, of course, often preached before, I had it pretty much at command, and being self-possessed to an unusual degree for so young a man, I gained a lodgment in the hearts of the people from that morning. If I mistake not, my text in the afternoon was, John i. 14, "The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us," &c. A bold and adventurous flight for so young a preacher! However, it proved me at once to be sound on the subject of Christ's divinity, a truth dear to the minds and hearts of the pious.'—P. 68.

After he had preached 'four Sabbaths with much acceptance,' the elders of the congregation offered him the *pastorate*. Seven venerable old gentlemen came to offer to this boy the charge of their souls. He was perfectly equal to the occasion, without—he thought on a review of the scene—being unduly lifted up by it. His formal acceptance of the invitation is conveyed in an epistle, beginning with an apostolic form of salutation, and expressed throughout with a gravity, unction, and business-like precision, which prove in the youth of nineteen a precocious aptitude for government. Nor does he ever by a single youthful indiscretion forfeit the prestige of his inauguration. At the close of his life he can congratulate himself on never having committed a great mistake, and certainly it is marked by a consistency, and a uniformity of aim, which characterises few lives. He removed at once to Birmingham, and entered on his work.

Amongst the subjects taught from the professor's chair at Gosport had been rules for a discreet matrimonial choice. Marriage seems almost as imperative a necessity in the Congregational ministry as it is in the Greek Church, and here the students were instructed how to choose a wife. From Christian graces the teacher passed by a natural step to other requirements. He recommended his students 'not to seek great riches—not to marry for money's sake, but, if possible, not without money.' This is a point which all advocates, and exponents of the voluntary system, seem to regard as its correlative, without which it cannot be expected to succeed. The minister must not marry without money. Thus indoctrinated, it is no wonder that the homeless young minister, arrived at his destination, began to fulfil the law of his class, and to look out for a wife. If there is a point on which he prides himself in reviewing his career, it is his choice in this particular; and twice he had the opportunity of evincing his prudence and discrimination, for his first wife only lived ten years. Writing in old age of this period, he has

evidently in mind the importance of impressing on the students of his day the principles which had guided his choice, passing on, as it were, the traditional teaching which had influenced his own youth. If we are disposed to be diverted by the gravity, unconscious of ridicule, with which the subject is treated, we fully acquiesce in the convenience of the arrangement, not only for young Congregational ministers, but also for many in our own Establishment. It is the inculcating from high quarters such considerations as a deliberate rule of action that we object to. As a matter of fact, it so constantly falls in with a law of fitness that ladies of fortune should marry clergymen disqualified by their unremunerating profession from increasing their own inadequate incomes, there is often so exact an interchange of secular and even higher advantages in such a union, the husband acquiring leisure and freedom from care in the exercise of his functions, the wife gaining a position at once of dignity and usefulness, that no one can withhold unfeigned approval and satisfaction in such a right adjustment of things. But whenever the chair of authority and popular opinion unite to recommend our young clergy to 'marry money,' and they set themselves deliberately to follow the advice, we still shall feel that the Church is secularizing fast, and that the people love to have it so.

Mr. James gives the history of his first marriage in a very straightforward manner, and with confidence that his whole course of action was under the immediate direction of Divine providence.

'Among my congregation were two sisters of the name of Smith—Mary, and Frances Charlotte. They were the daughters of Dr. Smith, a respectable physician of the town, lately deceased. Their father, before his death, had furnished for them, in prospect of his departure, a house only two doors below that in which Mr. Frears lived. I was thus thrown into the company of these ladies, especially by meeting them at Mrs. Walford's, an aged, pious, and most intelligent woman, and an intimate friend first of Dr. Smith—who wished to marry her—and then of his daughters. Mrs. Walford lived exactly opposite the house occupied by the ladies. My attention was soon directed to Fanny, the youngest. I had been one day most earnestly praying for Divine direction in this important step, and during prayer Frances Smith occurred with such force to my mind, that I considered it an indication of Providence that my attention should be directed to her, to which I was encouraged by Mrs. Walford, her intimate friend; and on December 2, 1805, I made known to her my attachment, and my wishes to obtain her hand and heart. I was accepted. As she was living in her own house, there was no need of long delay, and on the 7th of July the following year we were married at the parish church of Edgbaston: so that I had only to remove from my kind friend, Mr. Frears', to the next door but one, where was everything made ready to my hand.'—P. 90.

We should not quarrel with this if Mr. James did not at the same time take pains to prove that he was not consulting his own

natural feelings in this step. He says that 'God chose for me better than I should have chosen for myself,' a statement, we think, incompatible with those stirrings of affection which should prompt the thought of marriage; and in order to impress upon his reader the peculiarly providential and holy character of this union, he actually indulges in a strain of disparagement in the matter of those merely natural charms and graces which lovers see, or at least think they see, in the object of their choice. He had no business, we maintain, to tell the world that from first to last he was very conscious that his wife was plain.

'This dear and eminent woman had few personal charms, but her countenance was intelligent and thoughtful, with a cast of mild and reserved benevolence. Her character, spirit, and temper, were a combination of matured female excellence. She had little sprightliness or vivacity; was not obtrusive in conversation, yet was not taciturn, but ever ready with invariable good sense to bear her part in the ordinary subjects of discourse. Her demeanour was grave, but by no means gloomy. Profoundly humble, and beautifully meek, she could never offend, and was rarely offended; though I have known her roused to dignified displeasure on some occasions, both before and after our marriage. Her prudence, sound good sense, sobriety of mind, and correctness of judgment were exemplary. All this was veiled by a delicate and invariable modesty, and sanctified by eminent piety. After our marriage, when she became better known to the congregation, she was hailed as an angel of God, and I believe that there was not an individual in either the church or the congregation to whom she was not an object of love, interest, and esteem.'—Pp. 91, 92.

Possibly, however, the old man thought it for edification to disclaim all illusions. There may have been more natural feeling in the affair than he could remember. There was evidently in this connexion the charm of a social rise. Miss Smith was thought by her friends to be doing ill for herself. He implies that this lady and her successor were in manners above those amongst whom they moved, he attributes to both 'patrician bearing,' and ease and grace of manner. Any charm people are not used to, affects the imagination like beauty. This lady, the mother of his children, of whom he always speaks with warm affection, only lived ten years.

It is remarkable, considering Mr. James's wide popularity in after years, that the commencement of his ministry should have been an acknowledged failure; for seven years his congregations were small, and but few new members were added to the books. This was probably owing to a reaction from early strain. He himself attributed it to want of care in the preparation of his sermons—to trusting too much to his ready flow, and perhaps to his voice. But preachers with 'a very free command of sonorous, if not 'accurate English, and with a voice which, for sweetness, richness, and pathos, has been rarely equalled, never surpassed,' can generally find hearers. It is far more likely that his energies

were overtaken both by previous excitement, and by (what his biographer does not notice here) the necessity of preaching three sermons every Sunday: a burden which was remitted after seven years, when an assistant was provided. During this period, he endeavoured to make up for a deficient education by reading and study; and at length, by a singular instrumentality, shone out into publicity. During the repairs of his own chapel, he occupied the 'Unitarian pulpit;' there his merits became known, though his editor is careful to explain that this was the occasion, not the cause, of the sudden increase of popularity. The ellipse was over by 1812, when these early years of disappointment suddenly gave way to a career of success. Mr. Thomas Wilson, of Highbury, the leading layman of his sect, brought him forward, appointing him one of the preachers by turn at Hoxton Chapel, and his merits as a speaker were discovered about the same time. His son considers that his chief talent lay in this power: calls him by nature an orator, always able to divine what was suited to his audience, and to adapt himself to them; and quotes, with pardonable pride, the opinion of Lord Holland (it is not said on what occasion), that as a persuasive speaker, he was surpassed only by Charles James Fox and Lord Chancellor Plunkett.

But sermons under this system of preaching evidently become orations; and much light is thrown by this volume on the construction of sermons,—a much more elaborate process than the parochial system encourages amongst ourselves. It is assumed that a carefully prepared sermon is preached dozens of times; that the mode of delivery is a study; that the audience require, and even demand, an amount of weekly excitement: as, for example, Mr. James's congregation, when he was absent from home, would write to him, complaining of the 'supplies in his absence;' and he had to answer, that only 'a sinful fastidiousness' could object to such preachers as he had provided for them. One of the most notable of Mr. James's sermons was preached (1816) for the London Missionary Society at the Surrey Chapel, which, before Exeter Hall was opened, offered the most important and exciting arena for their orators. The place was full hours before the service began. All the leading preachers in London and the provinces occupied the front seat in the gallery.

'The sermon, which occupies fifty pages of the Collected Works, and lasted two hours, was not read, but delivered *memoriter*. The preacher's brother sat in the pulpit with the manuscript in his hand, prepared, if there was a moment's hesitation, to suggest the forgotten word; but, from first to last, the discourse was delivered exactly as it stood on the paper—not an epithet or a preposition was changed. At the close of the first hour, the preacher requested permission to pause for a few minutes, and the people sung a hymn. Such was the excite-

ment of the congregation, that during this temporary interruption of the discourse, oranges were thrown into the pulpit to refresh the exhausted orator. The hymn finished, he rose again, and recovering his strength, thundered on for another hour, and closed at last with a peroration, anticipating the homage of all created things to God and Christ.'—Pp. 143, 144.

The congregation listened with enthusiastic admiration; the preachers in the front gallery, 'at the more thrilling passages, murmured their applause;' all but 'John Elias, the great 'Welsh preacher,' who exclaimed at the end, 'I believe the cross was there, but it was so heaped up with flowers, I could not see it.' The editor owns there is some truth in the criticism, but at the time, the impression produced by the sermon, both on hearers and readers, 'cannot,' we are told, 'be reported now without appearing to be guilty of the wildest exaggeration.' In a year or two from this period, it became necessary to rebuild the Carr's Lane Chapel, which was wholly inadequate to the demands upon it. An accident connected with the building shows the more general uses to which they put their meeting-houses.

'Not long after it was opened, an incident occurred which might have been attended with very appalling circumstances, and which placed me for several hours in a very painful situation. At the annual meeting of the Missionary Society, the abandoned idols, which had lately been imported from the islands of the South Seas, were exhibited on the platform in front of the pulpit. As the clock gallery was the most favourable place to gain a view of them, this was crowded to excess. After the business had proceeded for about an hour and a half, I received a pencil note to this effect:—"By all means stop the clapping of hands and stamping of feet. The gallery shakes under us. I have already heard two distinct cracks." This was signed by a young architect. Upon the receipt of this note, I was thrown into a most dreadful dilemma. If I gave the alarm, the mischief by the sudden rising and rush of the people would in all probability be done; and if I said nothing, and the gallery should fall, I should be blamed for knowing the state of the case and not giving notice of it. We did stop the clapping, and the business went on. For two hours was I kept in this agony of suspense and dread. Happily, the meeting ended without any accident. Upon examination, it was found that we had been preserved from an appalling catastrophe by an interposition of Providence, little less than miraculous; for the two middle beams that support the gallery were found cracked quite through.'

'After the opening of the new place, things went on for many years in an even kind of prosperity. The chapel was filled, the church increased, and the sun of prosperity shone upon us with cloudless splendour.'—P. 160.

This means to express the large congregation, the increasing number of members who, from fifty at the time of his entering upon the charge, rose to more than a thousand, to the unbroken harmony between pastor and flock, and to the success of his preaching.

In all the notices of preaching from his own pen, we observe that his avowed aim is, not the edification, but the conversion

of his hearers—not, of course, that edification is not in the mind of every earnest man, but conversion is his text. It seems to be assumed that every hearer who is not a member ‘is unconverted,’ he writes to his young colleague, in a strain of encouragement. ‘If there has not been splendid success of conversions, there has been general acceptance.’ He speaks of another minister: ‘I do believe, as far as preaching goes, he converts more souls than I do.’ He is ‘sorrowfully impressed’ that the work of conversion goes on slowly in our churches. He speaks to a large and attentive mass of regular hearers, who are not converted—who know they are not, and who are to be brought to a certain open statement of convictions and change of feeling, after which they are safe. It is always assumed to be perfectly ascertainable who have gone through this change: though the confidence is not always derived, we must observe, from any peculiar sanctity of life; for Mr. James brings very home charges against those in whom he most relies. ‘Stagnancy characterises our churches.’ ‘Our churches are, in my opinion, far from a sound and healthy religion,’ and constant similar expressions. All persons making the required profession expect to be admitted to membership, and the pastor is to satisfy himself of its genuineness by certain tests—a very arduous responsibility; for here the singular admission is made that, once a member, there is little hope for further spiritual change.

‘I know that it is dangerous to reject a young and timid Christian; but, on the other hand, admission to the church after profession is generally considered by the individual as a certificate of personal religion; and should they be still in an unconverted state, in that state they will, in all probability, die; so that a too ready admission of persons to the church is, in effect, to be accessory to their self-deception, and therefore to their destruction. Hence I have often felt perplexed; and though I have been more strict than many of my brethren, there are many, very many, whom I now wish I had rejected.’—P. 329.

and again,—

“I have sometimes seen cases in which there has been great solicitude till a profession of religion was made, and then it ceased, and the mind relapsed into indifference, and reposed upon its profession in spiritual sloth.”—P. 351.

The principle of always preaching with a view to conversion from a state of alienation, and of absolute security for those who have passed through a spiritual change, both constitute fundamental differences between sectarian and essentially church teaching; the Church assuming a germ that may grow, a spark that may yet shine in every hearer; though, undoubtedly, the subject of conversion is profitable to us all, and the need of conversion must be felt whenever man acknowledges the reign of sin and error in his heart. Powerful as Mr. James’s preaching is deemed to have been, holding men’s attention, inducing ‘seasons

of solemnity,' constantly attracting new hearers, it is surely a comment on what we have been saying that the *young* were least interested and impressed by it. It is clear that there was something that did not hit their case, or adapt itself to their consciousness. The following passage from the chapter written by his son bears upon this :—

'I must also state, as necessary to the understanding of my father's character, that, though so amiable, tender, and loving, he was entirely deficient in sympathy for any feelings unless he himself had experienced them. He could not enter into joys and sorrows which he thought unreal, puerile, or unworthy. He could not understand seductions and temptations which had no power over him. He could not patiently listen to vain hopes and groundless fears which he had never himself known; and he never seemed to me to understand exactly the state of mind and soul produced by error, sin, doubt, or disbelief. He was accustomed to address men and women in masses with arguments which he knew ought to prevail with them, and he could not enter into each particular case, and adapt his reasoning to it. When he succeeded, it was by exhibiting fairly the gospel of God, itself suitable to all cases, and sufficient for all emergencies. He believed it himself, declared it in love and tenderness, and left it to act for itself; and each mind he addressed received it, and appropriated it for itself.

'Hence he was not generally appreciated by young persons, particularly not by educated young men, who needed and wished to have brought before them some special view of Divine truth adapted to their usual habits of thought and feeling; and this not being done, they felt that they were not understood by him, lost all interest in his conversation, and could not speak before him. It was, in fact, only matured and experienced Christians, with views and tastes in unison with his own, with whom he really had a fellow-feeling, and who, on their part, were at home with him. He preached often specially to the young, and such sermons were often very interesting, but not to the young more so than to grown-up people. The number of young persons who attended the chapel was very small in proportion to the congregation; and the young men in the church, unless in the lower ranks of the community, were very few. My father, at one particular period, noticed with dismay that no deacon had a son a member of the church.'—Pp. 574, 575.

We can understand that children, habituated to a strain which others hear with startling effect for the first time, must become callous to it. He evidently did not know how to get at them. We find him sending messages to the daughter of his American friend and brother, Dr. Patton. 'Give my love to Emily, and ask from me, if she has yet given her heart to Jesus. It is a solemn thing to outlive a revival without being converted.' And to the same young lady: 'Is Emily a Christian yet? Does she love Christ more than the world?' There is a pastoral epistle to a girl's school, written with a sincere anxiety for their good, but mistaken in the same way. 'He tells them impressions and convictions, that do not soon end in conversion, terminate in confusion and disappointment. I have known young persons who, though deeply impressed with pious subjects at school, have lost all their impressions at home,

‘even though their parents were pious people.’ By which we would gather that he found himself powerless with young people unless he could affect them in masses. And if girls were a difficulty, we need not wonder that he pronounces young men ‘a class of persons in this country, and in our congregation, more hopeless than any other.’

For these and all other difficulties, the resource was, and in this system must be, excitement. Mr. James threw himself into revivals with a deliberate enthusiasm; he felt them necessary. He never seems to have entered into the difference between the American and the English character, and mourns over the insensibility of his country as compared to American impressibility and tendency to act in numbers, as though the differences were all against us. And yet it seems as though he were driven by his system rather than by feeling to this view, as though he must take up revivals to be logically consistent, for he was most candidly alive to their danger in the working. In the close communication he kept up with the American Congregationalists, he was informed of every movement; and we find first such notices as ‘Of revivals, strictly so called, I am sorry to say we know nothing in this country. It is true that religion is, as I think, steadily advancing, but it is more in the way of silent, unmarked progress.’ Soon after Dr. Patton comes to England as Mr. James’s guest, preaches revivalism, and the subject is put forward amongst the dissenting ministry,—

‘The subject of revivals still continues to occupy the public attention. The greater number of our ministers have preached upon it, and many have printed tracts, treatises, or sermons, copies of which I herewith send you. My expectations, I confess, are not sanguine as to the results. Our professors are so entangled with the world in various ways, that I do not look at present for any great increase of their spirituality of mind or their devotional habits. My chief hope rests upon the ministers, who will, I think, be stirred up to a greater devotedness to the duties of their office, and a more intense earnestness after the conversion of sinners.’—P. 253.

And we find him writing to have some difficulties explained—

‘I must say, that I feel so deeply interested in the subject of revivals, that I am anxious to have every objection to them removed. The existence of our National Establishment is, in this country, a great impediment in the way of such a state of things here. I am quite convinced that, had not the Church of England been set up again at the Restoration, religion would have been in a far better state in the British empire than it is now.’—P. 251.

An effort was made, but it fell flat. A year after he writes (1829),—

‘I am sorry to say that I think the stir about revivals begins to abate in this kingdom. We have taught, preached, printed, and prayed about it; but somehow or other it is, I fear, slipping from the public mind. I see no signs of an approaching awakening. I hear no rustling in the tops of the mulberry

trees indicative of the coming breeze. We do not seem prepared for the blessing. Our people are brimful of the world in most directions; if not of the love of the world, yet of the care of the world, and there is little room for the subject of revivals. My own church, I thank God, is in a tolerably flourishing state; yet I cannot speak of an awakening. We shall add to our fellowship this year perhaps about seventy members, which is certainly with us an unprecedented number. But the generality of our members appear to me to be in a state of much lukewarmness.'—P. 257.

And again,—

'Alas! for England, on the subject of revivals! No symptoms of an encouraging nature appear in our churches; no certain signs of renewed vigour; no unambiguous tokens of the descending shower are to be discerned. The little stir that was made about two years ago has nearly all died away; and though it has left in some few instances a happy result in renewed ministerial exertion, it has not been followed by any visible general result.'—P. 261.

He is ready to lay all the blame of this deadness on the Church of England, and is reverentially complimentary to the land so happily free from the evils of a religious establishment on all points except slavery, on which he delivers his testimony with a persistence which seems to have eventually alienated his brethren of the United States from him. Slavery first pressed itself on his mind in the light of a hindrance to the revivals.

'I am the more solicitous about the matter in consequence of the revivals of religion with which your land has been visited and blessed. It is becoming more and more common for humane and even religious persons to meet our accounts of these gracious visitations with the taunt, "Let them learn humanity towards the blacks, and we shall then perhaps be inclined to think better of their religion." This is sufficiently mortifying to one who has said so much about America as myself.'—P. 269.

But revivals had other drawbacks even in America. We find, in a letter to Dr. Sprague,—

'Oh, what a time was it at Northampton under the ministry of your illustrious Jonathan Edwards! and yet there is a problem connected with that revival which I cannot solve. In five years after it took place, the hearts of the people were so turned against him as to account him their enemy, or at least to treat him as if he were so.'—Pp. 250, 251.

To which Dr. Sprague replies,—

'“You suggest, in your letter, a difficulty respecting the revival at Northampton and Jonathan Edwards. I have not the means, at this moment, of referring to printed documents on the subject, but my impression is, that it admits of easy explanation. That that part of his congregation who passed through the revival without becoming Christians, should have been more restless than ever before, and less patient of his close and pungent dealing with the conscience, you will readily perceive was a natural consequence of their having been in a greater or less degree awakened under his preaching, and having resisted the Holy Spirit. I have myself often seen cases, during a revival, in which persons who have been regarded as models of everything that is amiable, and among the best specimens of human nature, have exhibited against the revival, and all who were active in promoting it, the venom of a viper. And there have been instances not a few, in which this has laid the

foundation, on the part of those who have not been converted, for a deep and incurable prejudice against the minister; he has been guilty of the sin of disturbing their consciences, and they cannot forgive it."—P. 252.

This we call an unsatisfactory solution, but probably the only acceptable one. The consequence, in Mr. James's own case, of this movement, or attempted movement, seems to have been the composition of his best known work, 'The Anxious Inquirer.' This little book, which has sold in hundreds of thousands, and been translated into many languages, was suggested after the meeting of a congress of ministers on the subject of conversion. It is not necessary to enter into its characteristics; of course it embodies his opinions; but the secret of its success beyond other works of the same school, lies in the fervour with which it was written, and the deep, serious study it demands and claims as its due. As a *tract*, it seems to us to stand on quite different grounds from the majority of these effusions. It was written for individuals, and with such in his eye; it opens with a very solemn exordium, insisting that it shall be read in solitude, with every circumstance of awful, impressed attention. He writes perfectly convinced that it is a critical moment with every reader whose eyes fall on his pages; he feels that he is setting down words of salvation with the fullest intensity of which he is capable. We quite believe there is no pretension or assumption of solemnity for a purpose in all this; it was the action of the revival movement (a failure elsewhere) on his own mind.

"Take the book with you," writes the author, "into your closet; I mean your place of retirement for prayer; for, of course, you have such a place. Prayer is the very soul of all religion, and privacy is the very life of prayer itself. This is a book to be read when you are alone; when none is near but God and your conscience; when you are not hindered by the presence of a fellow-creature from the utmost freedom of manner, thought, and feeling; when, unobserved by any human eye, you could lay down the book, and meditate, or weep, or fall upon your knees to pray, or give vent to your feelings in short and sudden petitions to God. I charge you, then, to reserve the volume for your private seasons of devotion and thoughtfulness; look not into it in company, except it be the company of a poor trembling and anxious inquirer, like yourself."—P. 290.

Contrast this tone with that of the ordinary tract, which may, in some parts, look very like it. The tract which is vaguely addressed to an unknown public, thrust by perfunctory hands into unwilling ones, only soliciting a passing attention, thankful for any sort of reading, without one evidence of real earnestness in any one concerned—writer, selector, distributor; what wonder, then, if not in the reader either? In another point also it differs from the ordinary popular treatise, that it addresses itself to those minds already occupied with Divine things. The words of the title are technical and recognized terms in sectarian

phraseology. 'I have began an anxious inquiry meeting,' writes Mr. James to his friend, previous to his particular appropriation of the expression in his book, and he only designs that such shall read it. Being thus real, the fruit of feeling rather than dogmatism, it is comparatively free from the repelling formalism and rigid system of many of this school in defining the Spirit's operations:—

'From Mr. James's Autobiography it appears that his own spiritual life had not passed through the precise chronological development, which some systematic writers on conversion have insisted upon. He had known the uncertainties and vicissitudes, the temporary victories and the subsequent defeats, the vacillation and inconstancy which most commonly mark the first efforts of the soul to forsake sin and live for God. In the almanac, winter melts into spring, spring brightens into summer, and summer ripens into golden autumn, by regular gradations. But the seasons are too wilful to obey the almanac: far on in spring, sometimes in the very heart of summer, we have cold winds and wintry snow; and often in March or April we are gladdened by days of warmth and sunshine that seemed to have missed their way, and to belong rather to July. It is just so in the rise and progress of religion in the soul; and it is one of the great excellencies of the "Anxious Inquirer," that it prescribes no exactly-defined experiences through which the mind must pass in order to arrive at rest in God. The reader is not distressed by the apprehension that perhaps in his case one link in the chain has a flaw in it, and that all the links that follow are therefore worthless. The endeavour to manufacture faith in Christ and love toward God, by an elaborate process of spiritual chemistry, is a most perilous mistake; and I repeat, that the "Anxious Inquirer" is free from the imputation of encouraging this delusion.'

—P. 303.

In the various testimonies given by the biographer to the marvellous effects of this little work, it generally transpires that the mind of the recipient was predisposed to accept its teachings, and in a frame to be influenced and stimulated by it. The facts related are all expressed with the sharp definiteness of detail, and exactness as to numbers, which characterise sectarian statements on spiritual phenomena. In one case, 'twenty-seven persons were hopefully converted' by a single copy; in another, nine friends assembled together found that each had received from it 'needful guidance and stimulus, by which they had been led to trust in the Lord Jesus;' and at a public meeting, where the author was present, a Dutch minister told of twelve students for the ministry who, of his own knowledge, had been converted by it in the Dutch translation. Not only to Churchmen, but, probably, to all readers, its extreme popularity must be now a matter of some wonder. It operated on Mr. James himself, very naturally by impressing him with a deep sense of his own conspicuous place in the world, expressed not in a vain spirit, but still with an abiding force.

But from the first he had been sustained in a consistent career by that self-respect and self-assertion which belongs to some characters, and gives weight to all that they do by investing it

in their own eyes with importance. When we consider his origin and early life, it is wonderful how he assumed a standing even in youth. His first marriage helped this. He was thus independent of his congregation, who, on their part, probably had more satisfaction in endowing their pastor with a fair income than if he had been in circumstances to need it more. As far as we are told, he never allowed money to be a subject of difficulty with his flock. On one occasion he was invited to transfer himself to Manchester, with the offer of a thousand a-year from that congregation. Though at the time he was in the receipt of only 300*l.* at Birmingham, he was not tempted to leave his flock. His own means, indeed, must have been ample; but this fact relieves him from some suspicions which the history of both his marriages might fairly give rise to: the second is thus recorded:—

‘Three years after the death of his first wife, Mr. James married again. In his narrative of his second marriage, after a few introductory observations, he says,—

‘By God’s good providence I was directed to one in every way worthy to be the successor of my first wife, and this is saying much. The widow of Mr. Benjamin Neale, of St. Paul’s Churchyard, had been sought by many, but she was reserved for me. Her first husband was a man of distinguished worth; intelligent, yet modest and rather reserved; public spirited, yet meek and gentle. He was just emerging into public notice, and was likely to prove one of those to whom the present and future ages, and all the nations of the earth, will be indebted for those invaluable institutions which are doing so much for the conversion of the world to God. By one of the mysteries of Divine Providence, he was cut off by consumption at the age of thirty. His widow was left without family, and in the possession of property to the amount of about 20,000*l.* This was placed at her own disposal, with an understanding that so much of it as was mentioned by him, amounting to 5,000*l.* or 6,000*l.*, should at her death be devoted to religious institutions. Half of this sum she immediately paid over to various societies, reserving the other half to come after her decease. Instead of continuing housekeeping, Mrs. Neale, at the death of her husband’s mother, with whom she for a while resided, went into lodgings, that she might have a larger sum to dispense in works of general and religious charity. As a short memoir of this eminent Christian is in print, together with a funeral sermon preached by Dr. Redford of Worcester, and entitled “Faith Triumphant,” I shall not enlarge here upon her early history, nor her closing scenes. We were married by Rowland Hill, her particular friend, at Christ Church, Blackfriars, in London, February 19, 1822. She proved in every respect a helpmeet. Possessed of a masculine understanding, great public spirit, equal liberality, and eminently prudent, she was well fitted for the station into which Providence had now brought her. She had her failings; but they were very light and small compared with her many and eminent virtues.’—Pp. 161, 162.

And then follows on this unimpassioned narrative a few words of counsel to young ministers, coming with especial weight from so much happy experience:—

‘It has long been my opinion that the comparative failure of many of our ministers in their public career is owing to unsuitable marriages. They are in

haste to be married, and frequently make most unwise selections. Unhappily, some of them had formed juvenile engagements before they entered upon their studies, which they could not very honourably dissolve, though very much below them; while others have most incautiously allowed themselves to be entangled while at college. It is but rarely that a student makes a wise choice. The result is, a frivolous, weak, moneyless, thriftless woman becomes his wife—a young family comes on—difficulties increase—a small stipend, hardly sufficient to obtain necessaries, is all they have to depend upon—the spirit of the husband and the pastor is broken, and he wears out life in moving from church to church, without being useful anywhere. He has had little leisure, and less disposition, surrounded as he has been with pecuniary embarrassments and domestic perplexities, to improve his mind and add to his stock of knowledge. What is the preventive of all this? Celibacy? By no means; but great care, deliberation, caution, and patience in the selection of a wife, united with much and earnest prayer to be guided aright.—P. 162.

This appreciation of money was no doubt more because a good income brought independence and position, than that it ministered to luxury or display. And both his wives furthered this appropriation of their wealth. They practised a grave and orderly hospitality, especially to students of the college, under Mr. James's visitorship, and to travelling ministers. Writing of his second wife to Dr. Sprague, he speaks of 'the excellent woman whom he had more than once seen presiding with grace, intelligence, and piety, over his domestic affairs.' But ordinary visiting was uncongenial to himself, and was discountenanced by his second wife as tending to worldliness, which it was her special mission to suppress. He speaks with contempt of evenings spent in listening to young ladies' efforts on the piano. Dinners he never went to; and, indeed, his life was so taken up with public and private professional engagements, and he saw such variety of people, that this, in fact, was his society. When popular ministers of any 'denomination' spend their lives in public,—courted, sought after, listened to with deference—it is easy for them to disparage amusement, and what is meant by relaxation. On this subject his son writes,—

'I have another remark to make which also may appear paradoxical, that, notwithstanding the amiability and tenderness which I have already referred to, and the geniality on which I shall shortly dwell, he was inclined to asceticism in his practice, and to austerity in his opinions. But his writings and his habits bear me out in this. The Puritans were so, and the spirit of the Puritans was in him. And, so far as my acquaintance with ecclesiastical biography extends, this has been the leaning (and it seems to me it must be so) of every eminent saint, whether among Protestants or in any of the old Episcopal communions either of the West or East. I know he contended that this was not the case with him, and deprecated inferences to that effect being drawn from his writings; but what he said showed that he was conscious of this tendency in all his opinions and practices. He seemed to me to have attained the character which, it is said, John Calvin, in his admiration for St. Bernard, wished to form in all his followers, that of a man who, while he played his part and did his duty in the world, should yet have his heart as

much in heaven as if he had been in a cloister. And this is the specific state of mind my father again and again exhorts to.

'I feel bound to state that these tendencies increased in him very much after the revivalist preachers from the States visited him, who (in contrast to his old friend Dr. Patton, who became more hearty and genial every time he came to us) seemed to set themselves against all enjoyment whatsoever. My stepmother so far fell in with these views as to wean my father from friendly visiting. And, with reference to this, my uncle James once said to me, "My brother would never have had the hold he has on his people if he had from the first pursued this system, and it will make us a rope of sand."—Pp. 575, 576.

'Friendly visiting' must always be a ministerial difficulty; but probably Mr. James would have admitted that he did not forego anything, and made no sacrifice, in renouncing the social gatherings of his congregation.

His son bears testimony to the consistent piety of his private life, to his affection and sense of duty in all the domestic relations. The people about him were attached to him. His biographer, Mr. Dale, who had known him for years, as a student, and afterwards as colleague or co-pastor, gives valuable testimony to qualities which have their peculiar exercise in such a connexion, often a trying one.

'In his heart of hearts, the aged minister loved and trusted his younger colleague—was his generous, unflinching champion against all suspicion and unjust censure—was ingenious in his devices to secure for him public respect and honour—was open and frank in the private discussion of questions on which they disagreed—never suggested, because he never supposed, that the authority of his own age, reputation, and experience could justify him in requiring the young minister to sacrifice or trifle with his convictions of truth or duty. In one word, Mr. James had a noble, generous temper, and in all his conduct towards me, there was never the faintest trace of suspicion or selfishness.'—P. 475.

His flock evidently desired more frequent visits from him. But this duty, 'shepherding' is the term used, never seems considered an indispensable one amongst Dissenters; and from what we read here, Mr. James must have recognised it in a much greater degree than his brethren, though he writes,—

"Perhaps I have erred in being too little with my people. This, however, is to err on the right side. No one could ever call me a gossiping minister. Many, I am persuaded, make themselves too familiar with their people in this way. A dignified reserve is better than a jocular familiarity. By these means I have, through God's blessing, I believe, maintained the respect as well as the affections of my people."—P. 468.

However, he is not always so satisfied on this point, and has a good deal on his conscience in the matter of 'facetiousness,' which in certain moods he makes vows absolutely to renounce, as though he felt it an habitual temptation. We can only say that his writing bears no trace of this lively and attractive infirmity.

If some 'members' complained to him that they had not seen him in the course of the year, he accepted it as a sign of prosperity, for had there been death or misfortune he would not have been so remiss. His whole course shows a clear determination to be as little dependent on his flock as possible, as he did, in fact, secure for himself, through *prestige* of character and easy circumstances, a standing analogous to that of a church dignitary. He never really tested the voluntary system. He exclaims on 'the beauty of the principles of the Congregational mode of church government,' but he never allowed them legitimate play. He possessed the art of government in his own person; always held the first place; boldly claimed that the pastor's voice shall be next to the New Testament; was supposed to rule his people with a rod of iron; and while he compliments his deacons very early in his career, he reminds them at the same time of their subordination, as when he says,—

"I am sorry to say, from an extensive survey of our independent churches, that deacons have not unfrequently been the torment of the minister, and the bane of the congregation. A mean and unworthy lust of power, a busy and meddling disposition, which loves to intrude into things beyond the line of its appropriate sphere, have multiplied in modern times the character of the Diotrophes of antiquity. It has ever been the happy lot of the church in Carr's Lane, and of its present minister, to be blessed with deacons who know how to support their office with dignity, without pride—with authority, without usurpation—with activity, without officiousness."—P. 135.

For more than fifty years he continued their minister, always holding his own and carrying his points. One element of division he was very careful to avoid, for the female members—an exception, as it appears, to the general rule—had no votes in the Carr's Lane meeting. To predominate for fifty years over a thousand people, to be a ruler all that time, implies real power and, probably, considerable strain. He had infirmities which show this—singular nervous impressions and fancies, which withheld him from the ordinary itinerant labours of a popular preacher's life for twenty years. He could not sleep in the interval between a promise to preach away from home and its fulfilment, and he was even haunted by whimsical fear, amounting to mania, as by the dread, if he trusted himself among strangers, of being put into a room from whence there was no escape in case of fire. It is wonderful, with these symptoms of a brain overwrought, that he could pursue his ordinary routine with such steady, laborious propriety. There is throughout a singular mixture of practical good sense and judgment, and a love and faith in excitement, and in every crude scheme for reviving spirituality and carrying out great religious effects. We have seen how he caught at Revivals. He was warm for the temper-

ance movement, discontinued the use of wine in his own person and at his table, and writes,—

“For the sake of the world, my dear sir, and all future generations of mankind, I beseech you to go on in this splendid course of national virtue. I have patriotism enough to wish this laurel had been plucked by my own country; but since this is not granted to *us*, I rejoice that it is *yours*. It is a precious one. Preserve it from fading by a relaxation of zeal in the cause, and deem not the honour complete till the world shall talk of the United States as a land without a still, and without a drinker of ardent spirits. If you ever arrive at this elevation of moral greatness, your example *must* and *will* be felt in the world.”—Pp. 512, 513.

Words like these might appear impossible from the pen of a sensible man. Living in Birmingham later in life he had to drink wine, and his son writes:—

‘He was always so abstemious that it was no matter of self-denial to him to give up drinking wine, but according to the opinions of all his medical advisers he injured his constitution by doing so. He felt, however, so strongly on the matter, as an advocate of the Temperance Society, that when compelled to take it temporarily he always left it off too soon. But his taking wine, even under these circumstances, was, at least on one occasion, noticed in an abstinence journal in language appropriate to the relapse of a reclaimed drunkard.’—P. 579.

He was zealous for the missionary cause, and especially for the conversion of China; Morrison, a name well-known among missionaries, having been his college friend. On occasion of the Chinese rebellion, 1852-53, a friend conceived and he put in practice the strange idea of sending a million New Testaments to China, to assist and inform the dawning faith of the rebels. He did not propose that missionaries should *accompany* the Testaments to account for them and explain them. They were to do their work, as a shower fructifies the place where it falls, without any human agency. They were to appear in China, and to convert it. His friend wished this mission by books to be the work of the Sunday Schools of England. Mr. James wished the Bible Society, ‘as representing the Catholic Church,’ (constituting the scheme a small temporary Bible Society for China,) to contribute, and he carried the day. A long address from his pen appeared in the *British Banner*, where, after pressing the duty on all denominations of sending out missionaries, but pointing out the impossibility of united action, he continues—

“Is there nothing to be done at this juncture by the union and co-operation of all at home and all abroad for the conversion of China to the pure faith of the Gospel of Christ? I say, for the pure faith of the Gospel of Christ. For it is evident that though the new faith of this body comprehends the *elements* of Christianity, it is, for want of the New Testament, in an imperfect and corrupted form. What they want is, the *Christian* Scriptures. They know more of the Old Testament than of the New. Protestants, now give your serious attention to what follows. I have lately received a letter from that

active and devoted friend of Christian enterprise, Thomas Thompson, Esq. of Poundsford Park, containing the noble proposal to *raise a fund immediately for printing and circulating in China* a million copies of the Chinese New Testament, *and earnestly soliciting me to lay the subject before the public, through the medium of the Press, and to call out the Sunday-school teachers and scholars to do the work.* The project of circulating a million copies of the New Testament is itself a vast idea. Is it practicable? Easily. Is it worth the effort, the pains, and the cost? Transcending all we can calculate. Shall it be done? Will not voices as numerous, though far more intelligent, as those which, in the eleventh century, under the wild enthusiasm of Peter the Hermit, shook the plains of Clermont, and raised the thundering shout, 'God wills it!' again say, 'God wills it'? What might not a million copies of the New Testament, poured into China at such a time as this, accomplish for the cause of Christianity, in correcting the false notions of the insurgent leaders, of the nature of our holy religion, and in circulating a pure Christianity among their followers? Unhappily, Christianity is now presented mixed up with fables, and associated with fanaticism, war, and massacre. It is infinitely important that we should lose no time in presenting it pure and uncorrupted in its own inspired records."—Pp. 432, 433.

The scheme was taken up according to both proposals with great zeal. The Sunday schools, the Bible Society, and the denominations sent out, not one million, but two, or rather 'between two and three millions of Testaments.' Many ardent letters are inserted, many instances of youthful enthusiasm in the contributors and promoters of the movement. On this ground the editor ventures to call it a *successful* movement; but so far as concerns the object for which so much excitement was raised, we can only assume it an utter failure. As how could it be otherwise? Mr. Dale is obliged to enter into this part of the subject, and gives an extract to prove that some of the Testaments were distributed in China, and civilly received. He gives us no direct evidence that even one of them was read. He is therefore obliged to look for indirect fruits, as that the stir made in collecting the money for the Testaments is likely, he thinks, to create a deep and general interest in missions to China. We, on the contrary, believe that mistaken efforts, resulting in failure, are likely to produce apathy and disbelief in future endeavours. The little children who gave their pence under such magnificent promises, of which they hear no fulfilment, cannot be so easily roused again. They will look back on their previous feelings as a temporary excitement which ended in nothing, and perhaps take it as a precedent or a warning. We read, however,—

'It would be a mistake to estimate the importance of this unique and successful movement merely by the money which was contributed, or even by the vast number of Testaments which it has placed at the disposal of Chinese missionaries and colporteurs. Mr. James's proposal created a deep and general interest in missions to China, out of which may some day arise efforts to evangelise that country of a far grander magnitude than Protestant churches

have ever yet attempted. Just as the Testaments were beginning to be distributed, events occurred which for a time disturbed missionary operations.'...

'The recent interruption of friendly relations between China and western Europe has again checked our missionary exertions; but the hope may be justly cherished, that whenever the people of that great empire shall be accessible to the influences of Christian teaching, Chinese missions will be supported with an enthusiasm and a generosity which shall demonstrate that Mr. James did not write and speak and pray in vain.'—Pp. 446, 448.

We believe Mr. James really felt the isolation of a sect. All these efforts for united action are proofs of a yearning for something which Congregationalism did not give. He got into contests with the Church, frequently expressed himself bitterly towards it, but had all the while a respect for the piety which, strange to say, still lingered round so 'hopelessly corrupt' an organization, and had an evident longing for its good will. He thought himself driven, as a 'thorough-going Voluntary believing' that Establishments necessarily annihilate the distinction 'between the Church and the world, and render good men less 'useful than they would have been under other circumstances,' to oppose it, but pathetically complained of the consequences of his attacks. 'If a man writes against the Church, no matter 'on what compulsion, or in what spirit or manner, he is denounced throughout the kingdom.' And he frequently alludes to the grievance of the richer members of his congregation lapsing to the Church—a secession sure to be peculiarly distasteful to him. He was always contriving schemes for doing away 'minor differences,' and bringing men to act in any way together; and expresses a particular elation and gratitude when any of our clergy entered into them. We have said he originated the Evangelical Alliance, of which his autobiography contains the following notice:—

'No thoughtful Christian can be otherwise than afflicted by the multiplied sects, divisions, strifes, and controversies of Christendom. Strange and mournful it is that the prayer of our Lord for the visible unity of His people should not yet have been answered in any tolerable measure. I do not think that professing Christians are sufficiently impressed and afflicted by this state of things. They are not only reconciled to it, but often compare it to the varied colours of the rainbow, adding, by variety, to the beauty of the Church. This is a fatal mistake. It is disfigurement, not loveliness, that is much to be deplored, and we ought to do all we can to remove it. All cannot be right. There must be much error afloat in these diversities. I have often reflected upon these things. One morning, at my private devotions, I was much led out in prayer on this subject, and a suggestion came forcibly to my mind to do something to effect a union of Christians in some visible bond. I rose from my knees and sketched out a rough draft of a scheme of union. The May meeting of the Congregational Union soon followed. At that meeting I called the attention of the brethren present to the subject before them. Indeed, this was my chief object in going to the meeting.'—P. 397.

And he pursued the idea under the notion of having discovered the secret of real union, and turned the tables, so to say, on the Church. This, again, is a specimen of his eager faith in new schemes :—

“Conceive what an impression would be produced upon the public mind, by such a scene as Exeter Hall would present in this holy fellowship of brethren—the long lost wonder of a united church would be restored, the echoes of the ancient exclamation would be awakened, and thousands of voices would again be heard to say, ‘See how these Christians love one another!’ What a rebuke and refutation, I repeat, would it give to the proud isolation of Puseyism. The public, when they saw this arrogant and malignant spirit retiring within the schools of Oxford, to adopt the ceremonial, and imbibe the intolerance and maledictory exclusiveness of its Roman master, would place in striking and beautiful contrast with it, the brightening and extending charity of other denominations, and in seeing them all come forth to such a noble fellowship of love, would be at no loss to determine who were in possession of the true catholicity.”—P. 403.

The evangelical alliance of practice against theory has long been before the world, and we cannot therefore pursue its history further, except to observe that it does not seem to have satisfied its founder. He complains that its seed fell among thorns—‘the thorns of religious controversy ;’ though at first they had found no difficulty in establishing a basis of doctrine in which twenty different sects professed to be able to agree. This reliance on excitement, this search after new schemes, as the only defence against apathy and declension, is not, we think, a feature of individual character, but the recognition, by a clear-headed man, of the inevitable needs of his system. In his private religion he manifests very little of this temper. He never professes any height of rapture, sudden emotions, or startling changes ; nor does he ever assume a state of feeling, because, according to a system, it ought to be there. He does not really care to write much about himself, and owns to some indistinctness of memory in his notices of his past history. His long period of popularity, and influence with his party, do not seem to have spoilt him. He kept a real watch over himself, and was on his guard against the temptations of his position. It is something for a successful preacher to be diffident of publishing his sermons ; to be uneasy at notes being taken, lest any subsequent use should be made of them. He knew, and would not be persuaded out of the knowledge, that his power lay not so much in the composition as in the utterance ; and we find him unconsciously arranging the order of a preacher’s gifts for his calling, according to this conviction. *Voice* and *manner* came before talent and piety ; and he was so much in the habit of insisting on the importance of manner, that many people ‘supposed that all his power lay in voice, tones, and gesture.’ These

seem, in reality, to have been very effective, at least, upon his particular class of hearers, though we cannot suppose they would have always pleased a refined taste, nor was he really satisfied with the results of his preaching; he seems always to have felt that something was wanting; a certain meagreness and insufficiency may have pressed upon him, though his was not a mind independent enough in its workings to detect the causes of certain unsatisfied desires. He had no sympathy with doubts and difficulties, and never understood them. He accepted from the first his place as 'Congregational pædo-Baptist,' as much without a question as though he had really lived in an age of unbroken, visible unity. We shall not find a more favourable example and specimen of Dissent than he presents in his own personal character and steady course from this very absence of the real schismatical element, and loyalty to the system in which he was born: while we cannot but feel how much that character would have gained in elevation, true wisdom, and utility, had it been permitted to form and expand under the deep truths, higher teaching, and nobler influences of the Church.

ART. V.—*The Pilgrim: A Dialogue on the Life and Actions of King Henry the Eighth.* By WILLIAM THOMAS, Clerk of the Council to Edward VI. Edited, with Notes from the Archives at Paris and Brussels, by J. A. FROUDE, Author of the 'History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Death of Elizabeth.' London: Parker, Son, and Bourn, West Strand. 1861.

THE volume whose title appears at the head of this article may be regarded as a sequel to the first two volumes of the 'History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Death of Elizabeth.' Mr. Froude, in his preface, very justly observes, that the outward events of the reign of Henry the Eighth are patent and acknowledged, and he appears, in the publication of the present volume, to have had it in view to offer a contribution towards the settlement of the question as to the causes in which those events originated. The Statute-book, he somewhat inaccurately remarks, gives one account of those causes; popular tradition gives another. It would have been nearer the truth if he had asserted that the Statute-book, as represented in the first two volumes of his history, gives an account of those transactions which run counter to the received opinion of the present day, which has a pedigree reaching to the period when the events took place. The sentence which follows, we presume, contains the true explanation of the publication of the 'Pilgrim;' 'The opinion of a contemporary English gentleman, who had no object to gain by dishonest advocacy, cannot but contribute something towards a just decision between the two authorities.' The truth of the statement is absolutely unexceptionable. The proposition is in itself none the worse for approximating to a truism. It is, as it were, the major premise of the volume before us. The volume itself is the minor premise, and contains the tacit assumption which vitiates the argument. If William Thomas was a contemporary English gentleman who had nothing to gain in the reign of Edward VI. by defending the acts and opinions of Henry VIII., his testimony is most valuable. Mr. Froude seems to have been in entire ignorance both of William Thomas and his work when he composed the earlier volumes of his history. Whether or not he has taken the trouble to inquire into his character, or whether his information concerning the writer extends no further than the facts which can be gathered from the work itself, we will not take upon us to determine; but as it is important towards forming a tolerably accurate judgment of the value of the work

that the reader should know something of the character of the writer, we will commence with giving a short account of Mr. William Thomas, author of the 'Pilgrim.' And we shall offer no apology for supposing our readers as ignorant on the point as Mr. Froude professes himself to have been when he penned his first two volumes.

All that can now be known of William Thomas is to be gathered from the account of him given by Anthony Wood in the 'Athenæ Oxonienses,' under the year 1554. He has the advantage of appearing in this respectable company not because he was educated at Oxford, but because another person of the same Christian and surname took the degree of B.C.L. at that university in 1529. He was a 'Welshman born, or at least of 'Welsh extract, and was educated in all kinds of learning fit for 'a gentleman.' He was probably, therefore, born and bred a gentleman; but nothing is known of him further till the year 1544, ten years before he died, when some misfortune, not specified by his biographer, obliged him to quit his native place, and was the occasion of his residence at Bologna at the commencement of the year 1547, when the news of the death of Henry and the accession of Edward arrived there. Here, being in the company of several gentlemen, he entered into discourse in defence of the said King, whose honour there had been wrongfully treated.

The discourse was afterwards drawn up, apparently, with a view to publication. The author appears to have lived in Italy till the beginning of 1549, and after his return to England was made Clerk of the Council to King Edward VI. (April 19, 1549). Wood attributes his appointment to the proficiency in modern languages, which he had acquired during his residence on the continent, and adds, that, as a reward for his attendance upon the council, he was presented by the king to the parsonage of Presteign, in South Wales, and a prebendal stall in Canterbury. It must be remembered that William Thomas never either was or professed to be in holy orders, nevertheless he enjoyed the profits of both these pieces of preferment till the accession of Mary. William Thomas may undoubtedly have been a Protestant on principle, but his Protestantism was at least profitable, and brought him in a sinecure income of what would now be estimated at some 3,000*l.* a year. The rectory of Presteign is still valued at about 1,300*l.* a year, as may be seen by reference to that useful annual, the *Clergy List*, and the prebendal stall was even at that time valued at '34*l.* and better' in the King's books. Even Protestant historians can scarcely reconcile themselves to the rapacity of the Clerk of the Council, and perhaps Strype felt the disposal of Church preferment to a mere layman

the more keenly, because he was himself so slenderly provided for in the Church. However, not to take Strype's account, we will refer to the original authority for this business about the prebendal stall.

It appears from a letter of Ridley's to Master Cheke, dated from Fulham, July 23d, 1551, that he wanted to confer the vacant stall upon one of three diligent preachers, two of whom are named—Bradford and Grindal. The latter, it appears, was the favourite, and Ridley was anxious to present him to it, in order to have him constantly in his diocese to preach. It is evident from Bishop Ridley's mode of writing that he had no very high opinion of William Thomas. His words are:—

'But alas, Sir, I am letted by the means (I fear me) of such as do not fear God. One Master William Thomas, one of the clerks to the Council, hath in times past set the Council upon me to have me to grant that Layton (the then possessor of the stall) might have alienated the said prebend unto him and his heirs for ever. God was mine aid and defender, that I did not consent unto his ungodly enterprize. Yet I was so then handled before the Council that I granted, that whenever it should fall, I should not give it before I should make the King's Majesty privy unto it, and of acknowledge before the collation of it. Now Layton is departed, and the prebend is fallen, and certain of the Council (no doubt by this ungodly man's means) have written unto me to stay the collation. And whereas, he despaireth that ever I would assent that a preacher's living should be bestowed on him, he hath procured letters unto me, subscribed with certain of the Council's hands, that now the King's Majesty hath determined it unto the furniture of his highness's stable. Alas, Sir, this is a heavy hearing. When papistry was taught there was nothing too little for the teachers. When the bishop gave his benefices unto idiots, unlearned, ungodly, for kindred, for pleasure, for service, and other worldly respects, all was then well allowed. Now, when a poor living is to be given unto an excellent clerk, a man known and tried to have both discretion and also virtue, and such a one as before God I do not know a man yet unplaced and unprovided for, more meet to set forth God's word in all England; when a poor living, I say, which is founded for a preacher is to be given unto such a man, that then an ungodly person shall procure in this sort, letters to stop and let the same, alas, Master Cheke, this seemeth unto me to be a right heavy hearing.'

The letter continues:

'And besides all this, I have a better opinion of the King's Majesty's honourable Council than, (although some of them have subscribed at this their clerk's crafty and ungodly suit, to such a letter,) than I say they will let and not suffer, after request made unto them, the living appointed and founded for a preacher to be bestowed upon so honest and well-learned a man.'

And that is our first instalment towards an estimate of the character of this English gentleman. Ridley was quite a pattern of meekness and gentleness, and is not very likely to have used so unsparingly the epithets 'crafty and ungodly' without good reason.

We proceed to the only other remaining incident in his life

that bears upon the subject. After the King's death it appears that Thomas incurred the displeasure of Queen Mary, and was deprived both of his place, and of all hopes of other preferment, lay or clerical. 'He hereupon,' we are now quoting Anthony Wood, 'designed her murder.' Wharton accuses him of devising the death of Stephen Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester. Whatever was the accusation, certain it is that he was sent prisoner to the tower of London, February 20, 1553, together with Winter and Throckmorton. On the 26th of the same month, 'being,' says Wood, 'much conscious to himself that he should suffer a shameful death, he endeavoured to make away with himself by thrusting a knife into his body under his paps; but the wound did not prove mortal. On the 9th of May, 1554, he was arraigned and condemned at the Guildhall in London, and on the 18th of the same month was executed at Tyburn.' Wood sums up his character as follows:—'He was a man of hot fiery spirit, had sucked in damnable principles by his frequent conversation with Christopher Goodman, that violent enemy to the rule of women, and one of more misguided zeal than true religion and wisdom.' 'He suffered death at Tyburn before mentioned, by hanging, drawing, and quartering, leaving then behind him the character, by some, of a person of good parts. What became of his quarters I know not.'

So much for the character of the witness. It may, perhaps, throw a shadow of suspicion on the value of his testimony. Still, it does not follow that the testimony is false. A suspicious witness may give valuable evidence in support of any case, if it is confirmatory of other testimony, and that especially if he has no bias in favour of the side for which he is summoned. Let us turn to the catalogue of William Thomas's works to see if they will supply any light upon the subject. He seems to have produced very little that was printed and published; but several of his writings have been preserved amongst the Cotton MSS. in the British Museum. In a well-known article, containing the Depositions in the cause of Henry the Eighth's divorce from queen Catharine, there is an account of William Thomas's evidence, from which it will appear that he had early attached himself to the winning side, and that he did not swerve from it, at least while the Protestant party were in the ascendant. And now the reader will be able to judge how much reliance is to be placed on the facts which rest on no other evidence than their being stated in the '*Pelegriño Inglese*.' Of the actual contents of the volume, both as regards fact and argument, we shall have something to say presently. But before we begin, we must be allowed to profess our astonishment at the ignorance to which Mr. Froude pleads guilty. We have before now, in the *Christian*

Remembrancer, exposed the reckless disregard or ignorance of State Papers and published documents, which was evidenced in Mr. Froude's earlier volumes. Had he paid common attention to the printed papers which were in existence before the publication of his first two volumes, he would have been saved from many a mistake; neither is it credible that with an entire acquaintance with all that can be produced, he could have undertaken the monstrous task of defending the character of Henry VIII. But this by the way. We are at present only concerned with the amount of notoriety gained by William Thomas. It is true he is described by Bishop Ridley, his contemporary during the reign of Edward VI., as one William Thomas; but he has certainly earned his claim to rank as an historical personage, by his subsequent career during the reign of Queen Mary. It would be almost incredible, if Mr. Froude had not stated the fact himself, that he was not aware of the existence of this volume, and should speak of a defence of Henry VIII. written after his death by a clerk of the Privy Council, of which he knew no more than it was mentioned by Strype, as if it were a thing wholly, or almost wholly unknown. Even now he has taken so little trouble to investigate the matter, that he appears to know no more about it than that there is a copy among the Harleian MSS. which he accidentally met with, and another in the Lansdowne collection, and that it was printed in the last century, with a number of other tracts written by the same author. Mr. Froude appears to have extracted from Anthony Wood's '*Athenæ Oxonienses*' what he has learned of the author of the tract. If he had consulted Dr. Bliss's edition of the '*Athenæ*,' he would have learned a great deal more than he appears to know. Who would have thought from Mr. Froude's description that this unknown and obscure clerk of the closet is mentioned in nearly every book on the history of the times which contains any references to original authorities? Burnet and Strype are not so very uncommon books. Several pages of the latter are devoted to giving an account of the author, and some of Burnet's vilest falsehoods are extracted from the '*Pilgrim*.' He is alluded to again and again in, at least, three of the recent publications of the Camden Society, and his works in MS. exist in three different volumes of the Cotton Library. A writer of the '*History of England from the fall of Wolsey to the death of Elizabeth*,' might, indeed, be pardoned for not happening to know the edition of the collected works of William Thomas, published in 1767, but it is quite a scandalous instance of neglect to have omitted to read the original documents in Strype's '*Ecclesiastical Memorials*,' amongst which are several of the papers of William Thomas, printed at length.

Although we do not attach much weight to the author's authority, yet as a literary production the work was, perhaps, worth reprinting. We have already alleged enough to prove, that as far as any evidence it may produce as to the character of Henry VIII., it is probably without value, because its conclusions are unsupported by other evidence, and the character of the writer is not such as to entitle him to our belief. It would have been very desirable if the editor had added notes at the foot of the page, to enable the reader to distinguish between the true and the false, the credible and the incredible; yet with the exception of a brief note on the first page, contradicting a false statement about Henry having left a legacy to Aretino, to whom the book is dedicated, there is no attempt to correct the numerous errors into which the writer has fallen. The editor admits that it is not free from mistakes; but in spite of the inaccuracies, which might reasonably have been expected in a history written from memory, he claims for it the value of representing the impression generally current in the country, the popular view of the conduct and character of Henry VIII. as received in England at the time of his death.

The dialogue is alleged to have taken place at the house of a wealthy merchant at Bologna. After some preliminary talk on the nature of the climate and country of England, the conversation turned to the subject of the tyrannical reign of Henry VIII. just then brought to a termination; and one of the company undertook to prove the late King to have been a tyrant, on the ground that the principal token of a tyrant is the immoderate satisfaction of an unlawful appetite, when the person, whether by right or wrong, hath power to achieve his sensual will, and that the person, also, who by force draweth unto him that which of right is not his, in the unlawful usurping committeth express tyranny.

The indictment laid is a heavy one, and consists of fourteen counts very systematically drawn up, and extending over above three pages of the volume, the remaining sixty or seventy being taken up by the defence. We need not transcribe them. We must suppose our readers fairly acquainted with the history of this period, and must refer them to Lingard or Hume, Sharon Turner or Tytler, as their respective prejudices or conclusions may incline them. The chief points alleged are, that the King cast off his lawful wife, the Emperor's aunt, after he had lived with her for eighteen years, and abolished the authority of the Roman see, because Clement VII. refused to justify the divorce, taking upon himself the papal title and authority; that he beheaded Bishop Fisher, of Rochester, and Sir Thomas More, because they would not be a party to such abominations; that

he overthrew the monasteries for the sake of their wealth, which he appropriated; that he broke his promise of pardon to the rebels of the North, and 'caused a number of the most noble of them to be put to death by divers torments.' The ninth accusation, which is the most difficult to answer, we will give in the author's own words:—

'And not his first wife, but three or four more, did he not chop, change, and behead them, as his horse coveted new pasture, to satisfy the inordinate appetite of his lecherous will? Two of his wives he hath caused to suffer death, and two remain yet alive.'

And lastly is added the persecution of Cardinal Pole, the murder of Pole's mother and brother, and the beheading of the Duke of Norfolk and his son. Before we go on to notice the rejoinder it is worth observing, that, to say the least of it, a contemporary defence implies a contemporary attack, so that Mr. Froude could scarcely claim this work, even were William Thomas's defence ever so conclusive and satisfactory, as the representation of the popular view of Henry VIII.'s character and conduct, received at the time of his death.

However, such is the accusation, which at least has no novelty in it. The defence consists of a vast number of statements made by the author, but very little argument that we have been able to detect. There is, moreover, one passage in the accusation which tells rather heavily against an observation made by the editor, in his preface. Mr. Froude seems to think it is ridiculous explanation, when the cowardice and servility of lords and commons are alleged as the account of Henry's tyrannical proceedings being allowed to go unquestioned. He says, 'the House of Commons need but have adjourned in a body from Westminster to Whitehall to have made the king their prisoner.' Yet this was the view of things actually taken by the person with whom William Thomas held this real or imaginary dialogue. He finishes the harangue, in which he enumerates the king's delinquencies with the observation, that 'not only his general proceedings, but also every particular and private part thereof was better known in Italy than in his own dominions, where, for fear, no man durst either speak or wink.'

The answer to the first accusation of the unlawfulness of the divorce, very easily settles all the intricate questions that arose, avoiding some and cutting the knot of others by the most barefaced assertions. Thus, the alleged virginity of Catharine is disposed of as unimportant, the author taking care to insinuate, that the issue of that marriage was that gentle lady, Mary, whose beauty and virtue you have most worthily commended. But, from all that appears in this narrative, the reader would

judge that the papal legate, Campeggio, who had been sent to try the cause, had decided the matter for the divorce. The whole statement of the case occupies exactly two octavo pages; but brevity can afford no excuse for beginning a sentence with saying that a legate *a latere* was sent to determine the cause, and ending it with the assertion, that after the matter had been long disputed, the error of the Pope's dispensation, for the marriage of Catharine and Arthur, was discovered, and his Majesty divorced from the same Lady Catharine. Who would have thought from such a description what was the true state of the case, that Henry, after having for years vainly attempted to extort a decision of his cause from Clement VII., had taken it out of his hands, had one of his own creatures consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury, for the express purpose of deciding the case in his favour, and had had it so decided some six months after he had been cohabiting with Anne Boleyn, and just three months before the birth of Elizabeth?

These two pages may be taken as a specimen of the value of William Thomas's book in an historical point of view. As a literary curiosity, we confess we are glad the book has been made accessible to English readers; and Mr. Froude must be allowed the merit of having proved that he is not absolutely singular in his estimate of the character of Henry the Eighth.

We have said that Mr. Froude has not taken the trouble to add notes corrective of the mistakes of his author; but more than half the volume is occupied by a series of notes giving a running commentary upon the text, and which may be spoken of as endorsing it in the main and supplying additional information on points which are briefly treated. The first of these notes occurs at page 18, at the conclusion of the two pages of defence of the King for the divorce from Catharine of Arragon. It might have been expected that so flagrant a violation of truth, as is implied in the defence, would have been at least cursorily noticed; but Mr. Froude seems to think, that if a thing did not take place in history, it ought to have taken place, and, without appearing to agree exactly with his author, treats his statement as a rough approximation to the truth, near enough for all ordinary readers. This note, which contains some valuable State Papers, which now see the light for the first time, is headed with the following piece of information:—

‘Judgment was never pronounced in the Legate's Court; but the case arrived at a point when the sentence, if sentence were given, could only be in the king's favour, and the Emperor, to protect Catharine, was obliged to insist on the avocation of the suit to Rome.’ The following letters add something to our

knowledge of the influences which were at work below the surface. Mendoza was a secret agent of Charles the Fifth, in England. De Praet, who became afterwards celebrated, was minister at Rome. The two letters which follow do not add much light to the history of the period; but they are interesting, as showing how entirely conversant Charles was kept as to all that transpired in England and at Rome, in regard to the divorce.

The extirpation of the Papal authority in England is the next count in the indictment, and the defence here occupies no less than ten pages. The writer finds it convenient to treat of the two counts as distinct. The accusation indeed connects the two, inasmuch as the opponent distinctly charges the king with annulling the authority of the Roman Church, in order to accomplish his will in the new marriage of his second wife, which Clement VII. refused to consent to. It was convenient to treat the abolition of the Papal authority separately, and not to confound it with that which was indirectly its cause. And here occurs the vilest lie of which Mr. William Thomas was guilty. He tells us, that the beginning of the abolition came from a suggestion of the Duke of Suffolk's, who asked his Majesty 'how this matter might come to pass, that a Prince, in his own realm, should so humble himself before the feet of a vile, strange vicious priest (for Campeggio there in England demeaned himself in very deed most carnally, in hunting of whores, playing at dice and cards, and sundry such other cardinal exercises),' whereto the king answered he could not tell, but only that it seemed unto him that spiritual men ought to judge spiritual matters. 'And yet as you say,' said the king, 'meseemeth there should be somewhat in it; and I could right gladly understand why and how, were it not that I would be loth to appear more curious than other princes.' 'Why, sir,' said the duke, 'your majesty may cause the matter to be discussed by your learned men without any rumour at all.' And thus 'inspired by God, he called divers of his great and trusty doctors unto him, charging them distinctly to examine what law of God should direct so carnal a man as Campeggio, under the name of spiritual, to judge a king in his own realm,' &c. We have quoted this passage at length, not for the purpose of examining how much of argument and how much of fallacy it contains, nor how it bears upon the cause, but merely to notice the fact upon which so much stress is laid. Now, the whole of this accusation against Campeggio is false. The only colour, or foundation in fact, that it has is this, that Campeggio when he came into England brought one of his sons with him. A contemporary historian, probably thinking the matter notorious enough, forgot to explain

how a cardinal could have a son born in lawful wedlock. The solution of the difficulty is simply this; that the cardinal was a widower before he was admitted to holy orders at all, and, from the single fact that he had children, William Thomas has trumped up the story, that an old cardinal of seventy years of age, who suffered so dreadfully from the gout that he was obliged always to be carried about in a litter, spent his time when he arrived in England as Papal legate, in all kinds of debauchery. If this is not a wilful lie it argues the grossest ignorance on the part of the writer as to the transactions in England fifteen years before the period at which he writes. Let the reader adopt which part of the alternative he pleases, either will supply the means of estimating the historical value of the rest of the narrative.

As to the argument by which the king is defended in his separation from the Church of Rome, it is nothing more than the common argument, which, whatever be its value, need not be here discussed. The doctors who are said to have settled the question, began by taking the Gospel for their absolute rule, and then easily discovered that no Scripture proof could be brought for the Pope's authority over kings and emperors; and the argument is represented as having the cogency of an *à fortiori* by representing that Peter, Paul, Solomon, and Christ Himself, commanded obedience to heathen kings; how much more is it due to a virtuous Christian king, that he should not be expected to appear on his trial before a vile, vicious beast, grown out of the dunghill, like Campeggio.

As a specimen of the mixture of argument and ribaldry, the following passage will serve:—

‘Christ having bolted the gates of Heaven, and barred the doors on the inward side, bade Peter keep those keys safe until the day of judgment. Before that time He would not that men should corporally enter in there by the gate, but fly in spirit over the wall. So that Peter, all the days of his life, sought to lead all true Christians by lively faith as his Master taught him, and not by opening the gates: and therefore hid the keys in his habitation at Antioch, where they lay many years unknown. At length, in the time of Phocas the Emperor of Constantinople, a simple priest found them, and marvelling at the curious workmanship (being as they were of divine operation), to gratify his lord the emperor with so rare a thing, went and presented them to his majesty, who, not knowing how to use them, gave them after unto Pockysface (I should say Boniface the Third), by whom they were first brought into the Roman Church. But in effect this Boniface, seeking the gates of heaven, failed of his way, and by misfortune happened on the gates of hell, where, unwittingly, he put those keys in use, and in very deed at once opened them; *quia portæ inferni non prævalebunt adversus eum*, in such wise that the devils got out and by plain force, after they had drawn Boniface in, kept the gates so wide open that all they who have followed Boniface in the Papistical belief thinking to climb to heaven, are fallen there by the way. Finally, to conclude of this Popish authority: It was not only found that the Pope was a false prophet, a deceiver and beguiler of human souls, but also the same Antichrist,

whom John accuseth in so many figures of his Apocalypse, forasmuch as Antichrist can be no otherwise expounded but Christ's contrary. And the Pope is so contrary unto Christ by Daniel that the matter was *toto* evident: for whereas Christ was humble, patient, chaste, poor, constant, and obedient, seeking always the fulfilling of His Father's will and not His own, the Pope, clean contrary, was proud, impatient, barbarous, rich, inconstant and disobedient, not seeking the fulfilling of any part of God's will but his own will only, in despite of all the world. . . . And it was not only proved that the Pope was thus contrary unto Christ in his doings, but also in his doctrine and ceremonies from the first to the last, too long now to rehearse; yea, and that not this living Pope alone, but all they that are dead, being comprehended under that name, especially from the time of the said Boniface the Third forward. For though the Popes have been diverse in outward actions, some less wicked than others, yet in their inward hypocrisy, they have all followed the devil's dam.'—P. 27.

Again, of the Church of Rome, the following is the writer's description:—

'I say that she is an arrant whore, a fornicatress, and an adulteress with the princes of the earth, and an express enemy of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and of the lawful Church the Espouse of Christ, for as Christ, &c.; so the Pope, son of the devil your god on earth in fornication engendereth on your whorish Mother Church all the bastards of perdition that believe remission of sins in him by ignorance and superstition.'—P. 28.

Note B, to which we are referred by the author in the course of this discussion on the papal supremacy, supplies a series of letters running over a period of three years, some from the archives at Brussels, some from the Imperial Library at Paris. They add little or nothing to our previous knowledge of the state of the case, as derived from the English State Papers. It is of no use to quote them as evidence of the determination of Henry to obtain a divorce, and to marry Anne Boleyn, for Mr. Froude ignores all the evidence that has been produced on this point, and affects to consider the king bent on obtaining justice. Yet every court in Christendom was aware of what was intended, and the expression of Francis I., requesting the Holy Father 'to put an end to this business as nearly 'according to the wishes of our said good brother, as is compatible with the honour of Almighty God,' shows what is plain on the face of the history, that Henry had determined to marry Anne Boleyn, but preferred doing it with the Pope's sanction if he could obtain it. There are some other statements in these letters which entirely overthrow Mr. Froude's hypothesis of the king's helplessness in any case where the nation should be strongly opposed to him. It is evident that the body of the people were quite opposed to the new match, and that there was a very strong feeling in favour of Catharine of Arragon, and her daughter Mary. The lords and commons were entirely

ridden over in this case, as they were in the subsequent divorce of Ann of Cleves, the commencement of the proceedings of which case were detailed by the king actually before they took place. Thus in one of D'Inteville's letters to the Bishop of Tarbes, we have the following :—

‘The common people, foreseeing these inconveniences, are so violent against the queen, that they say a thousand shameful things of her, and of all who have supported her in her intrigues. When the war comes, no one doubts that the people will rebel, as much from fear of the dangers which I have mentioned, as from the love which is felt for the two ladies, and especially for the princess. She is so entirely beloved, that notwithstanding the laws made at the last Parliament, and the menace of death contained in it, they persist in regarding her as princess. No parliament, they say, can make her anything but the king's daughter, born in marriage, and so the king and every one else regarded her before that Parliament. Lately, when she was removed from Greenwich, a vast crowd of women, wives of citizens and others, walked before her at their husband's desire, weeping and crying, that, notwithstanding all, she was princess. Some of them were sent to the tower, but they would not retract.’

Such are a few of the statements in the face of which Mr. Froude persists in his extravagant assertion that ‘Except for ‘the voluntary loyalty of his subjects, half-a-dozen noblemen ‘might at any moment have overturned the throne.’

The defence of the barbarous murder of the Cardinal Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, and Sir Thomas More, is comparatively a light business. After establishing that the supremacy of the pope is not to be found in Scripture, and after the abolition of the papal authority by act of Parliament, the refusal of these two persons to consent to the king's supremacy, backed by the fact that the cardinal's hat was on its way to the Bishop of Rochester, is in itself a sufficient vindication for the king in ‘shaving the bishop's crown by the shoulders, to see where the ‘pope could bestow the cardinal's hat ;’ whilst his serving More in the same way, after he had left them both four months in prison, and used all the means possible to dissuade them from their errors, is simply quoted as an instance of the king's leniency and clemency.

The author proceeds with the accusations *seriatim*. We pass by the defence of the usurping the supremacy, and the spoliation of the monasteries, which are only interesting as containing the stock arguments which are still used in the Roman controversy. One passage may however be quoted, because of the extreme audacity of its assertions, going, as it does, beyond even the accusations brought against the monasteries by their worst enemies. Many of them were no doubt dens of iniquity, but even the publication of the letters of the commissioners sent to investigate the case, who were their

worst enemies, only exhibits some of the houses, and some of the inhabitants, as grossly vicious. But the monasteries had no one to speak a good word for them, and so William Thomas hits them hard :—

‘There were discovered hypocrisies, murders, idolatries, miracles, sodomies, adulteries, fornications, pride, and not seven, but more than seven hundred thousand deadly sins. Alas ! my heart maketh all my members to tremble with another manner of fever than is the quartain, when I remember all the abomination that was there tried out. Oh Lord God (speaking under correction), what canst thou answer to the five cities consumed with celestial fire, when they shall allege before thee the iniquities of those whom thou hast so long supported. Note well (said I), these few words, and I shall tell you. In their dark and sharp prisons there were found dead so many of their brethren, that it was a wonder ; some crucified with more torments than ever were heard of, and some famished only for breaking of their superstitious silence, or some like trifle ; and, especially on some children, there was used a cruelty not to be spoken with human tongue. There was of the hermits some one, that under colour of confession, had used carnally with more than two or three hundred gentlewomen and women of reputation, whose names, enrolled by commandment, they showed unto the commissioners, insomuch that some of the self-same commissioners found of their own wives titled among the rest, with what conscience I report me unto you. There was working of wonders ; the friars and nuns were as whores and thieves in the open street, and there were saints that made the barren women bring forth children, unto whom there wanted no resort from all parts of the kingdom. Alas ! what should I say when Ptolemy his discourse, Pliny his memory, and Augustine his pen, joined in one man, should not satisfy to make him an apt author of so detestable a history as this abomination requireth ?’ P. 45.

Notes C and D, which are appended to this portion of the defence, contain some very interesting letters on the life of Cromwell ; the projected escape of the Princess Mary ; the insurrection in the North, and the death of Anne Boleyn, and those who were executed with her on the same accusation of adultery.

The defence of the king from the charge of ‘chopping and changing his wives at pleasure,’ is simply a rehearsal of a number of false stories, the object of which is to prove that it was more his misfortune than his fault. His first wife was divorced because she was his brother’s widow ; his second wife, William Thomas finds it convenient to believe was guilty of adultery ; the third lived with him the long period of eighteen months ; and the fourth, whom he is said, in flagrant violation of historical truth, to have loved out of measure, was divorced after six months’ cohabitation, to satisfy the king’s conscience, ‘when he understood that she was indeed another man’s wife.’ This is the history of the abominable conduct towards Anne of Cleves, against whom Henry took a prejudice at the first moment of seeing her, and invented an excuse of a previous engagement on her part, to get rid of

her, after foully aspersing her character. Even William Thomas had not the audacity to charge Catharine Howard, the fifth wife, with actual adultery, contenting himself with alleging her vicious life before her marriage, which was proved, and adding what was never proved, that, 'at the leastwise she sought means to commit adultery.' Of the last wife, Catharine Parr, as she had the good fortune to survive him, little need be said. The author counts it 'as one of the 'special successes that the king had in this life, that after so 'many changes, his glorious chance had brought him to die 'in the arms of so faithful a spouse;' but he either did not know, or at any rate found it convenient to forget, that Catharine Parr ran a very near risk of her life on the charge of heresy, and only contrived to survive the king by managing to convince him, with the utmost dexterity and address, that her disputes with her capricious husband had been undertaken, not in the interest of theology, but for the sake of amusing him, and diverting his thoughts from his sickness and bodily sufferings.

There is something absolutely ridiculous in the author's summing up his defence:—'And thus he hath had six wives, 'whereof two have died in their beds, two have suffered for 'adultery, and two are yet living.' The author thought that the statement of Catharine Howard's adultery, which could not have borne the light singly, might stand very well in the summing up, where she is carelessly coupled with Anne Boleyn. He did not seem to calculate upon much detective power in his readers, or he would scarcely have ventured on two contradictory statements in two successive pages.

At this stage of the argument, the Catholic opponent of William Thomas is pretty well convinced of the fallacy of the religious system in which he has been educated.

'Before this reasoning,' he is made to observe, 'I was as 'constant a Catholic man as any was living; and now that I 'have heard these many arguments, I am brought into a 'labyrinth that I know not which way to get me out.'

The reader will by this time have had enough of the case for the defence, and will probably prove not so compliant an adversary as it was the good fortune of Edward the Sixth's Clerk of the Council to fall in with. We shall only add, that the pamphlet ends with a most ridiculous panegyric, first of the reigning monarch, and then of Henry.

It must not be thought that we have undertaken to review the 'Pilgrim' with the sole intention of running it down, much less of blaming Mr. Froude for republishing it. We confess

we do not admire Mr. Froude's wisdom in doing so; for though his author adopts somewhat the same view of Henry's character that he does himself, we think the perusal of these volumes will have no tendency to make people believe as Mr. Froude does, or as Mr. William Thomas professed to believe. We have much to thank the editor of this volume for, in the contribution to a future history which he has furnished in the Notes. They are full of interesting State Papers, running over the last eighteen years of the reign of Henry VIII. We can only regret that there are not more of them; and still more, that Mr. Froude has not published the originals with the translations. Some may be inclined to regret the separate publication of State Papers such as these. But after all, it may be long before either our own Government or any foreign Government will sanction the publication of the collection from which they have been selected. And if we cannot have the whole, we may be grateful for the part. We fervently hope the volume may meet with such success as to encourage the editor to present us with some more of these original documents. Such papers are the only reliable materials for history. The letters which passed between kings and ministers, cardinals and bishops, may not, perhaps, represent what the writers thought. We at least read in them what they wrote, and what they meant others to think of them; and they give us the best clue both to the characters of the writers, and the nature of the transactions in which they were engaged.

- ART. VI.—1. *Peaks, Passes, and Glaciers*. By Members of the Alpine Club. Edited by JOHN BALL, M.R.I.A. F.R.S. Fifth Edition. Longmans. 1860.
2. *Vacation Tourists and Notes of Travel in 1860*. Edited by FRANCIS GALTON, M.A. F.R.S. Macmillan. 1861.
3. *A Guide through the District of the Lakes*. Fifth Edition. By WILLIAM WORDSWORTH. 1835.

THE industrious reader of daily journals in vacation months must have observed a new class of summer correspondence, which has come, within these few years, to the rescue of those much toiling operatives, the sub-editors on duty on sweltering August nights. It is not so long since no traveller on his annual trip would have thought of taking up his pen to indite anything to the *Times* except an hotel grievance, a solar eclipse, or the vivid picture of a city in revolution. Now, on the contrary, Alpine enterprise—in possession of an organisation of its own, of men who write and men who work—has grown from books and articles into newspaper controversy, the sure sign in any party of the possession of an outside public. The respective merits of Mont Blanc and Monte Rosa season the morning's coffee and the evening tea in country houses and pleasant parsonages, and when conversation gets slack, the morality of Alpine climbing forms a very useful resource, round the dinner or the work table, for prosy seniors or flirting juniors. There is a great facility for easy truism on either side of the question, while practical common sense and gentle chivalry respectively finds its subject-matter made to hand. Probably some brother or some lover, some cousin or some friend, has climbed, or will climb, or is supposed to be about to climb, some peak still uncontaminated by the miscellaneous throng, still unrepresented in Piccadilly entertainments. The last letter in the *Times*, cheerily and jauntily recording a fresh Alpine victory, affords a starting point only inferior to the horrid interest of a thrilling railway accident, or a gigantic metropolitan fire, equal, indeed, to the awe in which careful and palpitating dames regarded fox hunting in the jolly times when the squires indulged in deep over-night potations. In the meanwhile, the Alpine Club holds good its own. It talks, writes, records, publishes, dines, keeps up its numbers, excites the longings of the tourist public, and altogether shows itself very tolerably

indifferent to the ethical problems which its proceedings have originated.

Non nostrum est tantas, pueri, componere lites——

we should regard with equal regret the sudden cessation or the abnormal extension of the mountain mania, while of the two dangers we should be rather more inclined to fear the second. The rifle movement will not improbably, as it has been acutely said, thin the numbers of those who merely go abroad to kill time and keep themselves in exercise; young men who can spend their time more healthfully, and for themselves more amusingly, at Hythe, than in tramping from realm to realm, in exaggerated shooting coats, with cigar in mouth, and Continental Bradshaw in hand. But the reduction of this class will open out the way to another description of tourists, rather less unintelligent than the kill-times, but peculiarly unsuited for the stern toils of the mountain; the tourists who think it right to see things, and to seem to understand what they see—without any sufficient amount of original knowledge, or decided bias for anything in particular—bouncing *patres familias*, average members of learned professions, and walking young ladies. These are all persons peculiarly open to contagion. Cautious and family Swiss touring has almost in a lifetime grown up from a lounging saunter in the valleys of Hasli and Lauterbrunnen, and the towns which line the lakes of Geneva, Thun, and Lucerne, to the breezy walk across the Oberland, and the Chamouni expedition; and upwards again from these now familiar feats, to the Gemmi and the Grimsel, and the exploration of the Zermatt and the Saas valleys. It now seems to involve the attainment in the course of each single season of half-a-dozen heights, with a combined altitude of 70,000 or 80,000 feet. Feats like these are all very well for the *élite* of the Alpine Club, but they are worse than mischievous for the general English multitude. The fatal Alpine accidents, which have from time to time startled us at home, have been generally due to the culpable and boastful ignorance of some ill-advised tourist, who has thought it a fine thing to stake the lives and limbs of his honest and courageous guides against the silly reputation which he is likely to gain from his having been pulled, half numbed, and half fainting, by them, over some tremendous Col. For it must never be forgotten that high Alpine climbing is, at the best, playing with life and death. The risks must be, under the most favourable circumstances, tremendous, when, as one of the most distinguished Alpine climbers told us, the scrambler thinks himself well off if he finds just rough of ledge along the precipice to support the tips of his

fingers and the points of his toes. Under all circumstances, too, good or bad, the main share of the merit is justly due to those by whom the chief precautions are taken, the chief investigations made, and the chief dangers won—the guides. The traveller, therefore, who pays one of these fine fellows to imperil not only his own existence, but the livelihood of his family, for the sake of adding one more asterisk to the list of the Alpine Club's ascended peaks, incurs a great responsibility. So does the climber himself, for suicide is no more lawful than murder, and the lives which are risked are often among the choicest and those which we should least willingly spare. Professor Tyndall's adventure, to which we shall have to refer, in the ice chimney at the Matterhorn was sufficiently exciting, but the life at stake in that dilemma is one which has given many pledges to science. Still, we should be sorry to see Alpine scaling go out of fashion. Whether the thing is philosophical or not, it is a plain fact that muscle and pluck not only possess, but are meant to possess, a great and salutary influence in the conduct of the world's affairs, and that the nation which has the luck to exhibit them most conspicuously in the face of its neighbours, in the least pugnacious and offensive manner, goes far to win both respect and power. Now then, there can hardly be anything much less pugnacious or offensive than waging war against glaciers and peaks. In this campaign England has got the monopoly. The Alpine summits are politically the property of the Swiss Confederation, but practically they are the freehold of the Alpine Club, which has its head quarters in London. Germans reason upon this English passion for heights, and are puzzled; Frenchmen do not attempt to reason, and are still more puzzled; and among their many imitations of Englishmen, Americans hardly yet seem to have hit upon this particular one.

The bull

That makes *this* run is John, not Jonathan.

What the natives in general think of those adventurous islanders, whether they reverence them as inspired, or despise them as madmen, or with oriental feeling think them mad, and therefore reverence them, it is not within our power to say. Perhaps their feeling is a sort of dull gratitude to Providence for having created England to pour francs into Swiss pockets. But the result is the same, the topmost peaks of Europe are the Briton's inheritance. It is somehow natural that it should be so. The healthy old Norse blood, of which so many rivulets circulate through our veins, still makes itself felt in this late century of artificial civilization. The same spirit which makes

the Englishman emigrate so well, where he has to cut and win his way before him through the forest; the same spirit which makes him hunt and shoot, boat and play cricket for his pastime; the same spirit which makes him shoulder the volunteer rifle at the first breath of danger, drives him to attempt the Matterhorn. Science has made some of the best climbers, and they deserve the first praise. Daring is the motive power of the second class, and under due limitations we do not refuse praise to the men who are cautious, not less than brave, and who will not voluntarily risk lives for vanity or selfishness.

But all the more strongly we are convinced that those who can be morally justified in running these risks and incurring these fatigues are an exceptional body, and that the person who endeavours, without being tolerably sure of his vocation, to follow their example, is not far short of belonging to the same class as those proverbially are, who are their own lawyers. Albert Smith did get to the top of Mont Blanc and he came down again, and society was the gainer by this daring attempt of the jovial Londoner. But any guide at Chamouni will tell the inquirer that the attempt was a very foolhardy one, and that nothing could have pulled the experimentalist through but the extraordinary number of guides whom he took with him. One of them was casually asked by a traveller whether he had gone up with 'M. Smith,' and answered, 'O yes, that it was he himself who had supported M. Smith when he fainted on the summit, and gave him spirits to revive him.'

In proof that we are not exaggerating the perils of the enterprise, we shall call upon mountaineers to tell their own tale, and for the purpose, we shall not go further than the records of Alpine scramblings contained in Mr. Galton's *Vacation Tourists* in 1860. We should have gladly given a *précis* of Professor Tyndall's narrative of the frightful route by which, in company with Mr. Hawkins, he proceeded from Lauterbrunnen to the *Æggisch-horn* by the *Lauinen-Thor*; or, in plainer language, scrambled from the valley of the Aar, clean over the central Oberland group, into the valley of the Rhone. But we pass on to a still more daring feat of these two travellers, as narrated by Mr. Hawkins, which followed immediately after that passage—the attempted, but unhappily not perfectly successful, ascent of the steepest and boldest of European mountains, the Matterhorn, or Mont Cervin, on whose side they were the first of travellers to plant even a single footstep, so gloomily remote stands this giant peak among its solitary glaciers:

'Actual contact immensely increases one's impressions of this, the hardest and strongest of all the mountain masses of the Alps; its form is more remarkable than that of other mountains, not by chance, but because it is built of

more massive and durable materials, and more solidly put together : nowhere have I seen such astonishing masonry. The broad gneiss blocks are generally smooth and compact, with little appearance of splintering or weathering. Tons of rock, in the shape of boulders, must fall almost daily down its sides, but the amount of these, even in the course of centuries, is as nothing compared with the mass of the mountain ; the ordinary processes of disintegration can have little or no effect on it. If one were to follow Mr. Ruskin, in speculating on the manner in which the Alpine peaks can have assumed their present shape, it seems as if such a mass as this can have been blocked out only while rising from the sea, under the action of waves such as beat against the granite headlands of the Land's End. Once on dry land, it must stand as it does now, apparently for ever.'

Of the various perils which the adventurers had to encounter in the ascent, and again, upon the descent, we shall only offer one as a sample of what composes the summer pleasures of an Alpine Clubbist :—

'Soon our difficulties begin ; but I despair of relating the incidents of this part of our route, so numerous and bewildering were the obstacles along it ; and the details of each have somewhat faded from the memory. We are immersed in a wilderness of blocks, roofed and festooned with huge plates and stalactites of ice, so large that one is half disposed to seize hold and clamber up them. Round, over, and under them we go ; often progress seems impossible ; but Bennen, ever in advance, and perched like a bird on some projecting crag, contrives to find a way. Now we crawl singly along a narrow ledge of rock, with a wall on one side, and nothing on the other : there is no hold for hands or alpenstock, and the ledge slopes a little, so that if the nails in our boots hold not, down we shall go ; in the middle of it a piece of rock juts out, which we ingeniously duck under, and emerge just under a shower of water, which there is no room to escape from. Presently comes a more extraordinary place : a perfect chimney of rock, cased all over with hard, black ice, about an inch thick. The bottom leads out into space, and the top is somewhere in the upper regions : there is absolutely nothing to grasp at, and to this day I cannot understand how a human being could get up or down it unassisted. Bennen, however, rolls up it somehow, like a cat ; he is at the top, and beckons Tyndall to advance ; my turn comes next ; I endeavour to mount by squeezing myself against the sides, but near the top friction suddenly gives way, and down comes my weight upon the rope :—a stout haul from above, and now one knee is upon the edge, and I am safe : Carrol is pulled up after me. After a time, we get off the rocks, and mount a slope of ice, which curves rapidly over for about three yards to our left, and then (apparently) drops at once to the Zmutt glacier.'

The same volume contains the ascent of the Allelein-horn, by Mr. Leslie Stephen. One parenthetical event in crossing an hitherto untrodden glacier, is dismissed in a few words :—

'Suddenly, one of the party all but disappeared. A narrow crevasse had opened beneath him like a trap-door. With his feet wedged against one side, his shoulders against the other, and his back resting upon nothing at all, it was well for him that the crevasse had not been a little broader. The man behind caught him by the collar as he went down, and in a moment he was on his feet again, on sound footing. But the view of the two parallel walls of green ice sinking vertically downwards into utter darkness, has often come back to me since. Somehow, no one even then suggested the rope, and we plodded quietly and sleepily along—fortunately without further accident. f

hope, however, that I learnt a lesson as to the propriety of using the rope on such occasions. It is true that a man has in general no business to fall down a crevasse. A concealed crevasse is almost always so narrow that it is rather difficult than otherwise to fall down it without touching either side. If you are carrying your alpenstock "at the trail," so as to form a bridge as you fall, or if you throw yourself well backwards or forwards directly you feel your footing give, you must come upon a firm support. Still, no one has a right to presume so far upon his skill and presence of mind as not to adopt a precaution which secures absolute safety. There have, indeed, been warnings enough lately, to impress this upon most people's minds.'

In the descent a 'buttress' of rock was encountered:—

'The buttress I have mentioned may be compared to the roof of a church tilted up at a steep angle; the tiles on either side representing the snow-slopes, which on one side reached only a short way to the edge of the cliffs, and on the other, or western side, stretched much farther to a level and easy glacier. Now, it is generally pretty good going along an arête, even though inclined at a considerable angle, so long as you can keep, as it were, on the backbone, and have a slope on each side of you. It is like walking along the ridge of the church roof; but when the roof makes a sudden break in its elevation, as at the joining of the nave and chancel, or when spikes suddenly protrude and drive you to circumvent them by making a short excursion on the tiles, the difficulty is very much exaggerated. In our case the spikes were represented by sharp spires of impracticable rock, which at once sent us down on to a snow-slope, decidedly steeper and more treacherous than ordinary roofing-tiles.'

We pass over the narrative of such perils as a near escape from a deadly glissade in company with a broad sheet of new snow a few inches thick, and of destruction from the huge bounding stones, which the members of the party who kept an upper course, contrived to send rolling on their companions. A greater danger was soon attained:—

'By this means we kept carefully down to the end of the rock, and then, perched upon a narrow ledge, began to consider what was to be done next. We were looking down a blank wall of ice, inclined, I should guess, at some 45°, and reaching without intermission to the glacier, at a depth of several hundred feet below. I knew, by very disagreeable experience, that it would probably take several hours to cut steps down to it; and yet, near us, the ice showed no snow on its surface to help us. It was already late, the sun was near setting, and the mists were getting thicker every moment. Soon, even the glacier below us was entirely concealed.

After a lively discussion between the guides, we adopted the following plan, suggested by the ancient and many-counselled Peter: By fastening our two ropes together, we obtained a length of about a hundred feet. Moritz Anthonmatten then tied one end round his waist, and was let down by the rest of the party to the full extent of the rope. The ice along which he slid was so steep and so free from snow, that his weight was borne almost entirely by the rope. When he was let down as far as possible, there was still no foot-hold to be obtained. He quickly cut a couple of steps in the ice, and then freeing himself from the rope, cut a line of steps in a horizontal direction to a part of the slope where the snow seemed to be deeper. Another guide was let down in the same way, and helped to polish up the steps. Then each of the travellers, in succession, was lowered. We felt ourselves perfectly helpless

bundles, sliding along the vast sheet of hard ice which sank into the mists at our feet, and in which it was almost impossible to obtain hold enough with the point of one's alpenstock, to serve as the slightest drag.'

We flatter ourselves that we need not prolong our extracts in proof of our position. What then, if the higher summits are unattainable to the general run of masculine Swiss tourists, and to all the women, are these excluded pilgrims to occupy themselves about? We use emphatically the significative monosyllable 'all,' for we have no hesitation in pronouncing an absolute veto against any woman attempting the extreme perils and difficulties of exploits against which the very nature of her habitual dress pleads a decided prohibition, not to talk of the tricks with which the nerves are apt to pay off those who habitually disregard their existence. No woman has a right to court such adventures, nor have many men. Have the generality of travellers much to complain of? The answer to this inquiry must be sought in the character and quality of that which is left behind for them to enjoy.

A few samples picked out of the easiest and most accessible centres of Swiss scenery, the scenes which not only women, but children can and do habitually compass, may not be unacceptable, if they tend to settle the question. We venture to start with the best known in the list of Swiss mountains, the green Rigi, on the shore of the Lake of Lucerne, and we venture to say that it affords a panorama which is so lovely, that not all the conglomerated and cosmopolitan vulgarity which meets in the hotel on the summit, can avail to pall the pleasure of the sight. The serpentine twistings of the glorious lake of the Four Cantons, the blue and oval basin of the lake of Zug, so sheer under the gazer's feet, that one jump might seem sufficient to plunge him deep into its waters; the tortuous labyrinth of hoary peaks, south, east, and west; to the north, the more level district of hills and dales towards the lake of Sempach, serving as a foil to the rugged beauties of the remaining horizon, all combine to create a spectacle of beauty, which, once to have seen, is never to forget. Yet the ascent of the Rigi (2,000 feet higher than Snowdon), is simply a healthy day's exercise, a long walk, not more really difficult or dangerous than the climb of Greenwich or Primrose Hill, up a steep and grassy ascent, winding in and out of the woods, which man, woman, or child, their stout staff in hand, might easily accomplish, if only time enough is allowed for that which had best on no account be hurried over. Again, the Mer de Glace, by Chamouni, a spectacle of rugged sublimity which requires not the pen, but the pencil, or, still better, the camera, to describe it, is the prize of a no more than sharp scramble over stones

and rhododendrons, and through the trunks of spruces. That remarkable *coup-d'œil* of the flank of the Jungfrau from the Wengern Alp, across an apparently fathomless abyss, where that huge mountain rises sheer before the spectator, like a scene in a play infinitely magnified, is attainable by any one of tolerable strength at the trouble of a few hours' healthful upland footing.

But we are being tempted to linger too long on places which everybody knows something about. We must introduce our model moderate tourist to a centre of Alpine scenery, which is only now growing into that celebrity which it deserves from its facilities of access, combined with the gigantic beauties which it exhibits. Seeing that among the famous Alpine chains, the Bernese Oberland, and that great group culminating in Monte Rosa, which separates the Valais from Italy, are the loftiest and the grandest, so far as Mont Blanc may not incline the scale on the mere score of height, the discovery of some 'specular mount,' which, standing midway between them, might link the two systems into a well combined single panorama, is obviously a desideratum to be earnestly longed for by the tourist. How far this want has been realized, we proceed to explain. No one who has crossed the Simplon from the Valaisian side, will have forgotten his start from the ragged, picturesque, more than half Italian town of Brieg, with its dirty, uncivil inn, and general air of fussy laziness. The Alpine sight-seer must shut his eyes to the attractions of Napoleon's broad and well-made road, stretching away to the right, and, taking the course to the left, across the diminished Rhone by the neighbouring bridge, rattle a few miles in *char-à-banc* along the uneven but very viable tract which follows the Rhone glen, till it leads him to the wood-built, thoroughly Swiss village of Viesch. Here carriage travelling ends; women may be indulged with horses, but to men, their own legs and their own alpenstock are the surest way. Sheer over Viesch rises the object of this expedition, the Eggisch-horn, situate indeed in the Valais, but bordering on the Oberland. For a few thousand feet up the path winds in and out of spruce forests, and does not offer anything beyond the average amount of upland beauty. At last the woody zone is passed, and the traveller treads the Alpine down-like pasturage, where, upon a grassy ledge, snugly protected by a steep rise behind him, nestles, at some 7,000 feet above the sea, the un-architectural, but roomy and comfortable Hotel of the Jungfrau, kept by that active intelligent landlord,¹ M. Wellig, who a few

¹ In Switzerland the innkeepers are in fact the squires. They are almost always the richest and most important members of their respective communities, repre-

years since discovering, or having had pointed out to him, the amenities and advantages of this special height, with great labour conveyed the materials up the steep, acting as his own architect, his own builder and surveyor. The hostelry was speedily taken under the notice of the Alpine Club, to which it serves as a sort of club-house and rendezvous for these high-mountain adventurers. But as we are endeavouring to show, it is equally available for the delectation of the less ambitious climbers, whose most serious business in the Alps is the club-man's play on off-days. The summit of the *Æggisch-horn* is between 2,000 and 3,000 feet higher than the hotel, and is calculated to be some 9,700 feet above the sea. It is accordingly advisable to make the hotel a sleeping-place for one or two, if not more nights. The second morning will be devoted to the ascent to the summit, over ground where no tree will grow, but which is luxuriant in humbler vegetation; for the herbage, as soft and springy as a *Sussex down*, is speckled with innumerable blue gentians, and tufts of large wild heart's-ease. The road is rocky, and at some hundred feet above the hotel there is no longer any possibility of riding, but no lady, with a tolerably clear head and good footing, need have any doubts as to the practicability of her enjoying the delights of a completed ascent. The mountain just overpasses the height at which snow constantly lies, and so the course every now and then leads over streaks and patches of it, till at last the top cone is attained, a huge pile of detached and tumbled stones, which one would be tempted to believe the gigantic cairn of some antediluvian man of valour, were nature's architecture not manifest on all around. The summit once attained, if the day be clear and bright, the reward transcends the toil.

The *Æggisch-horn*, as we have said, rises midway between the Oberland peaks and those of the Valais. Of course the aspect of the former mountains, the well-known *Finsteraar-horn*, *Jungfrau*, *Mönch*, *Eiger*, *Aletsch-horn*, *Viescher-hörner*, is the contrary one to the familiar perspective from *Grindelwald* and the *Wengern Alp*, as it is the south side which is here displayed. In some respects this southern side is certainly inferior to the northern one, for the mountains are set upon a kind of table-land, of which, indeed, the *Æggisch-horn* itself, standing as it does to the north of the *Rhone*, is a kind of outlying spur. On the other side they rise from a comparatively depressed level. But out of this apparent inferiority

representatives in the legislature, and so forth. The arrangement has its advantages, but there is a dark side too, when the traveller wishes to protest before the magistrate against some extortionate charge; for it is likely enough that he may find that *Boniface* himself is justice.

grows a peculiar feature of transcendent grandeur. What we venture to call a table-land, is in reality a broad valley, sloping from the north in a curve to the south-west, and skirting the northern flank of the *Æggisch-horn*; and what a valley! not bottomed by green pastures, not stony and desolate, not the basin of a sparkling lake, but all of it for miles and miles ahead hirsute with the tumbled, crevassed masses of that which still possesses the reputation of being the largest glacier in the world—the *Aletsch Glacier*. As sheer under the *Æggisch-horn*, as the Lake of Zug is sheer under the *Rigi*, this huge ice-stream glides imperceptibly down to the valley of the *Rhone*. But the wonder does not cease here. Close under the peak of the mountain, due north, or nearly so—so perpendicularly under the spectator's eye, that it seems as if a stone might be dropped in, is a deep green lake, fenced on one side by perpendicular cliffs, not of stone, but of congealed water—the melting, in short, of the glacier ice, which, from some reason which we do not pretend to fathom, here suddenly resumes its liquidity to form the *Märjelen See*, a lake in which the icebergs float—icebergs of fresh water—vast masses of the glacier, which suddenly break off from the translucent cliff, and thunder into the deep pool.

The view to the south is of a different character, but equally—perhaps even more grand. The *Æggisch-horn's* own green and woody side, and the opposite bank of the *Rhone* valley, seen from the foreground, and the mountains to the left of the semi-circle, are not of the first class. But as the eye ranges towards the right, it falls successively upon summits, whose grandeur all who have seen must for ever remember, but can never adequately embody in description. First comes the *Fletschorn*, two huge masses at right angles to each other, of which the one nearest the spectator presents its end as the other does its flank, the two meeting like the junction of the nave and transept of a vast cathedral. Further on is the *Mischabel*, the highest of all the mountains wholly and exclusively in Switzerland, rising, in a cluster of stately, curved masses, rather domical than pyramidal, yet full of dignity. Next comes *Monte Rosa*, but from the *Æggisch-horn* it does not show to advantage: not so the next mountain in the series, the unique and wonderful *Matterhorn*, which here exhibits its steepled form with that strange shadowy suggestion of a thatched cottage, which its summit assumes, just as distinctly as at *Zermatt*, though so much further off. Still to the right of the *Matterhorn* is the single stately pyramid of the *Weisshorn*, ascended a few weeks since, for the first time, by Professor *Tyndall*, as recorded by him in the omnigossiping columns of the *Illustrated News*, which disputes

with the Mischalul for the first prize of grandeur, next after the incomparable Matterhorn. Very far away to the right, a small remote elevation is perceived in a distant range, which the guides tell you is Mont Blanc. There is no reason that it should not be so. Its presence does not help the *Æggisch-horn* panorama, and its absence would not mar it; but it is well that something of all the great Alpine peaks should be visible from that point.

We fully believe that the expert Alpine topographer would have no difficulty in indicating many points respectively as easy of access as the Rigi or the *Æggisch-horn* (for there is more than one shade of difference between the viability of the two summits), and respectively offering panoramas equal in interest to those which are open from the Lucerne and the Valaisian summits. This year has opened out a new summit, the Bell Alp, on the south flank of the Rhone valley. By our own selection of those two instances of the profitability of sub-Alpine climbing, we expose and confess ourselves one of the million servile followers of those who have pioneered the way before us: who can only nobly dare where they are sure to amply dine, and comfortably sleep afterwards, in some established hostelry. Well, let it be so, and let our enjoyment of the Alps be graduated at one degree: it will the more assuredly follow, that there may be many degrees of safe enjoyment between that which we revelled in, and the boiling point of perpetual snow. No sophistry of the most muscular experimentalists can stop the infinite variety of expeditions over the lower passes, and up the secondary peaks. Mind, eye, body, may derive equal pleasurable and healthy occupation from the pursuit of these moderate successes; and we unhesitatingly resume our little thankful office of counsellor by urging all tourists (women as well as men, in these days of fastness) who have not any special scientific end in view, or who are not conscious of physical powers, well tried at home in muscular feats and regular exercise, or of some special vocation to the enterprise, to look to a prolonged season passed in the continuous enjoyment of such feats, rather than to one or two overdrawn drafts upon the bank of health, discounted on the crest of some awful summit, painfully gained, and barely enjoyed at the very moment of acquisition, from the exhaustion of the much taxed forces.

We are prepared for the question, why, admitting our premises, there can be any particular reason for the average tourist expending time and cash upon a Swiss tour, when the British Highlands offer peaks relatively as lofty as those which lie in Switzerland below the line of snow and Alpine Club. Without

doubt, if men were merely monkeys, and travelling simply meant climbing, there would be considerable weight in this demurrer. But, for our own part, we regard the suggested comparison between the Alpine and Pyrenean, and the mountain clusters of Great Britain, as a simple impertinence towards the grandeur and beauty of the latter. It is simply degrading and vilifying to drag them into a comparison which they do not seek, and are not prepared to meet: the gauge of battle has, indeed, been thrown down on their behalf by a very distinguished champion, but in his attempt he vindicates his patriotism at the expense of his discretion and discrimination. The champion of the native mountains bears the memorable name of William Wordsworth, who, in his pretty, though, perhaps, occasionally crotchety, 'Guide to the Lakes,' has spun a sufficiently ingenious argument to prove the equality to, if not the absolute superiority, of the Lake scenery over that of Switzerland.

'For example, if a traveller be among the Alps, let him surrender up his mind to the fury of the gigantic torrents, and take delight in the contemplation of their almost irresistible violence, without complaining of the monotony of their foaming course, or being disgusted with the muddiness of the water—apparent even where it is violently agitated. In Cumberland and Westmorland, let not the comparative weakness of the streams prevent him from sympathizing with such impetuosity as they possess; and, making the most of the present objects, let him, as he justly may do, observe with admiration the unrivalled brilliancy of the water, and that variety of motion, mood, and character, that arises out of the want of those resources by which the power of the streams in the Alps is supported.—Again, with respect to the mountains: though these are comparatively of diminutive size, though there is little of perpetual snow, and no voice of summer-avalanches is heard among them; and though traces left by the ravage of the elements are here comparatively rare and unimpressive, yet out of this very deficiency proceeds a sense of stability and permanence that is, to many minds, more grateful—

“ While the coarse rushes to the sweeping breeze
Sigh forth their ancient melodies.”

'Among the Alps are few places that do not preclude this feeling of tranquil sublimity. Ilavoc, and ruin, and desolation, and encroachment, are everywhere more or less obtruded; and it is difficult, notwithstanding the naked loftiness of the *pikes*, and the snow-capped summits of the *mounts*, to escape from the depressing sensation, that the whole are in a rapid process of dissolution; and, were it not that the destructive agency must abate as the heights diminish, would, in time to come, be levelled with the plains. Nevertheless, I would relish to the utmost the demonstrations of every species of power at work to effect such changes.'

'As a resident among the Lakes, I frequently hear the scenery of this country compared with that of the Alps; and therefore a few words shall be added to what has been incidentally said upon that subject.

'If we could recall, to this region of lakes, the native pine-forests, with which many hundred years ago a large portion of the heights was covered, then, during spring and autumn, it might frequently, with much propriety, be compared to Switzerland,—the elements of the landscape would be the same—one

country representing the other in miniature. Towns, villages, churches, rural seats, bridges and roads; green meadows and arable grounds, with their various produce, and deciduous woods of diversified foliage which occupy the vales and lower regions of the mountains, would, as in Switzerland, be divided by dark forests from ridges and round-topped heights covered with snow, and from pikes and sharp declivities imperfectly arrayed in the same glittering mantle; and the resemblance would be still more perfect on those days when vapours, resting upon, and floating around the summits, leave the elevation of the mountains less dependent upon the eye than on the imagination. But the pine-forests have wholly disappeared; and only during late spring and early autumn is realized here that assemblage of the imagery of different seasons, which is exhibited through the whole summer among the Alps—winter in the distance—and warmth, leafy woods, verdure and fertility at hand, and widely diffused.

Striking, then, from among the permanent materials of the landscape, that stage of vegetation which is occupied by pine-forests, and, above that, the perennial snows, we have mountains, the highest of which little exceed 3000 feet, while some of the Alps do not fall short of 14,000 or 15,000, and 8,000 or 10,000 is not an uncommon elevation. Our tracts of wood and water are almost as diminutive in comparison; therefore, as far as sublimity is dependent upon absolute bulk and height, and atmospherical influences in connexion with these, it is obvious that there can be no rivalry. But a short residence among the British mountains will furnish abundant proof, that after a certain point of elevation,—viz., that which allows of compact and fleecy clouds settling upon, or sweeping over, the summits—the sense of sublimity depends more upon form and relation of objects to each other than upon their actual magnitude; and that an elevation of 3000 feet is sufficient to call forth in a most impressive degree the creative, and magnifying, and softening powers of the atmosphere. Hence, on the score even of sublimity, the superiority of the Alps is by no means so great as might hastily be inferred; and as to the *beauty* of the lower regions of the Swiss mountains, it is noticeable that, as they are all regularly mown, their surface has nothing of that mellow tone and variety of hues by which mountain turf, that is never touched by the scythe, is distinguished. On the smooth and steep slopes of the Swiss hills, these plots of verdure do indeed agreeably unite their colour with that of the deciduous trees, or make a lively contrast with the dark green pine-groves that define them, and among which they run in endless variety of shapes—but this is most pleasing *at first sight*; the permanent gratification of the eye requires finer gradations of tone, and a more delicate blending of hues into each other. Besides, it is only in spring and late autumn that cattle animate by their presence the Swiss lawns; and though the pastures of the higher regions where they feed during the summer are left in their natural state of flowery herbage, those pastures are so remote, that their texture and colour are of no consequence in the composition of any picture in which a lake of the Vales is a feature. Yet in those lofty regions, how vegetation is invigorated by the genial climate of that country! Among the luxuriant flowers there met with, groves, or forests, if I may so call them, of monks-hood are frequently seen; the plant of deep, rich blue, and as tall as in our gardens; and this at an elevation where, in Cumberland, Icelandic moss would only be found, or the stony summits be utterly bare.

We have, then, for the colouring of Switzerland, *principally* a vivid green herbage, black woods, and dazzling snows, presented in masses with a grandeur to which no one can be insensible; but not often graduated by nature into soothing harmony, and so ill suited to the pencil, that though abundance of good subjects may be there found, they are not such as can be deemed *characteristic* of the country; nor is this unfitness confined to colour: the forms of the mountains, though many of them in some points of view the noblest that

can be conceived, are apt to run into spikes and needles, and present a jagged outline which has a mean effect, transferred to canvas. This must have been felt by the ancient masters, for, if I am not mistaken, they have not left a single landscape, the materials of which are taken from the *peculiar* features of the Alps; yet Titian passed his life almost in their neighbourhood; the Poussins and Claude must have been well acquainted with their aspects; and several admirable painters, as Tibaldi and Luino, were born among the Italian Alps.'

'Deeming the points in which Alpine imagery is superior to British too obvious to be insisted upon, I will observe that the deciduous woods, though in many places unapproachable by the axe, and triumphing in the pomp and prodigality of Nature, have, in general, neither the variety nor beauty which would exist in those of the mountains of Britain, if left to themselves. Magnificent walnut-trees grow upon the plains of Switzerland; and fine trees, of that species, are found scattered over the hill-sides: birches also grow here and there in luxuriant beauty; but neither these, nor oaks, are ever a prevailing tree, nor can even be said to be common; and the oaks, as far as I had an opportunity of observing, are greatly inferior to those of Britain. Among the interior valleys the proportion of beeches and pines is so great that other trees are scarcely noticeable; and surely such woods are at all seasons much less agreeable than that rich and harmonious distribution of oak, ash, elm, birch, and alder, that formerly clothed the sides of Snowdon and Helvellyn; and of which no mean remains still survive at the head of Ulswater. On the Italian side of the Alps, chesnut and walnut-trees grow at a considerable height on the mountains; but, even there, the foliage is not equal in beauty to the "natural product" of this climate.'

We have extracted so much at length, that we must here suspend our work of quoting. Wordsworth goes on with considerations which have more to do with the Italian lakes than with high Alpine scenery, such as the inferiority of the vine and the olive cultivation over the 'pastured lawns, coverts of haw-thorn, of wild rose and honeysuckle, and the majesty of forest trees,' which he claims for his native Cumbrian scenes.

It will not have escaped the notice of our readers, that the imaginative writer of these passages dwells upon the accidents rather than the essentials of the two classes of scenery which he compares; and the question which he incidentally raises of the absence of the 'savage' in the landscapes of the old painters, even of those born under the Alps, is one which is well known in these days of art criticism to be a matter which calls for a far wider solution than that which he ventured. Still there is considerable truth in his assertions, as far as they go; setting aside the fantastic depreciation of that loveliest of deciduous trees, the beech: indeed, we may say, that as far as they go, we are inclined to accept them as extremely accurate; but they only state an incomplete truth, and the points of the argument which they overlook are precisely those upon which the entire controversy really hinges. The enthusiastic champion of Cumbria plays double or quits when he treats the district of which he holds the brief as *ejusdem generis* with the higher altitudes, against which he does not fear

to pit it. In order to ascertain the value of his assumptions, we may suppose the controversy reduced to the simple and practical test of a tourist's preference; and thus, by bringing it to the bar of a material and subjective issue, we shall be in a position to see where its strength and where its weakness lies, and thus show ourselves that we are really far more truly the friends of British scenery such as it is, than the writers who risk its being undervalued by critics in proportion as it is overrated by its advocates.

The unconscious fallacy which underlies the position assumed by Wordsworth is the sharp division of scenery which he implicitly makes into mountain and non-mountain scenery, and the consequent explicit assumption that all districts which fall under the first head admit of comparison between themselves, inasmuch as they stand in direct contrast to all other portions of country which are not mountainous. But the direct contrary happens to be the case. It is not a month since a writer in the *Saturday Review* truly, though rather whimsically and despairingly, complained that he could not make out what was a mountain and what a hill; and hazarded the conjecture that the distinction was more geographical than real, in which he was not far from wrong, given on one side that Celtic amplification which has created Wicklow mountains, and on the other that Saxon moderation which talks of the Malvern or Derbyshire hills. But below the altitude of the Wicklow mountains and Derbyshire hills there exist many classes of scenery eminently picturesque, and depending for their picturesqueness on inequality of ground, which under the Wordsworthian system would either not find their place at all in the philosophy of scenery, or else find one as ludicrously below their merits as that which he attempts to assign to Welsh and Cumbrian mountains is extravagantly above their deserts.

To return to our text. The inquiry whether the tourist had better find himself at Lucerne or Ambleside, when bent on a holiday, the convenience being assumed as equal on either side; if asked in the way of an absolute test of the comparative merits of the scenery of Lucerne and of Ambleside, is as wholly irrelevant to the issue as the comparison between Ambleside and Tunbridge Wells as an eligible centre for six weeks' summering would be as a gauge of Cumbrian and Wealden scenery. Yet if the theory propounded by the late Laureate were sound, it ought to bear being thus reduced to a material form. The Lakes are of course grander than the Weald, but each is so totally distinct from the other in many respects, that each is capable of giving pure and unmixed gratification without the alloy of impertinent comparison. The Peak of Derbyshire may

be a sort of half-way house, but its existence neither brings them nearer together nor mends or mars either. In the same way, Cumbrian and Alpine scenery—the lower mountain and the upper mountain scenery—as we may designate them, have respectively so many and such strongly marked distinctions as to entitle each to immunity from any comparison with the other.

In other respects, however, there is a strong family likeness between the two mountain districts, but in admitting this likeness we must, as we have indicated, also admit that the chain of likeness has links far below the lowest sweep of upland country having any claim to the appellation of mountain. We again fall back upon the question what makes mountains and what makes hills? Eternal snows do not constitute the distinction, or there would be no mountains in Great Britain. Absence of wood from the summit, a peaked outline, above all visible rock cropping out of the soil, are probably the best criteria which we can offer, but even these criteria are confounded by the question of comparative scale. As the traveller enters Dove Dale from the south, working up from the more level districts of Derbyshire and Staffordshire, he cannot fail to have his attention arrested by the twin eminences of Thorpe Cloud and Bunster, which guard the portals of the Dale like two vigilant sentinels. Their shape would elevate these peaks into the rank of mountains, their measurement reduces them to the class of hills. The long narrow dale to which they give access, measuring several miles in length from Ilam Hall to Walton and Cotton's Fishing House at Beresford Hall, '*piscatoribus sacrum*,' fulfils in the fantastical beauty of its rocks and caves and woody slopes and tumbling waters, all the conditions of a mountain glen or pass, but yet inexorable figures forbid to it the name of mountain scenery. Some miles to the north of that Fishing House, in the broad upper valley of the same river, are the prominent heights of High Weeldon, in form a perfect pyramid, and grandest as we have seen it, with the full moon rising behind it, and of Crome Tor, a savage point of tumbled rock. Each of these hills ought to be a mountain, and yet each of them can only be considered as a hill except upon principles of sovereign neglect for all tables of height and superficial area.

More familiar instances come even nearer home, within the metropolitan county of Surrey. The two parallel glens by which Box Hill runs, descending at its north-west buttress into the vale of Mickleham, are perfectly mountainous in their character. The heathery height of Leith Hill darkly rising from the broad Wealden sweep of cultivated fields, and commanding a vast sylvan view as far as the bold line of the South Downs, which White in his '*Selborne*' dignifies with the title of

mountains, is but a hill, and yet its character is that of a dwarfed mountain. Where then can we draw the distinction, or is there really any distinction to be drawn? Philosophically, none at all, but practically we may just as well say for sake of saying something, that an upland in order to graduate as a mountain must prove 1,500 feet elevation above the sea combined with some peculiar rockiness or peakiness of outline, or the possession of notable panoramic advantages. This distinction will help us to clear our notions as between the Peak and the Weald on one side, and Cumbria and the Peak on the other; but it does not help us in the land where the mountains range from 5,000 to 15,000 feet high, and still less in the Himalayan range, where twice 15,000 is the limit. We have come back to the same fact with which we started when investigating the question from another point of view, that the Wordsworthian attempt to create, *implicitly*, a sharply defined class of mountain scenery, as contrasted with all other kinds of scenery not absolutely flat, and then *explicitly* to institute a comparison between two groups of such mountain scenery with a considerable indifference to the question, whether the altitudes were 15,000 or 3,000 feet, must be a self-proved failure. From Holland to Nepaul the gradations are infinite, and being infinite they must for the purpose of comparison be, incorrectly, no doubt, but roughly and readily, lumped into a few classes, each class with extremities widely different from each other, and in every case with its superior extremity closely touching to the inferior extremity of the one above it. With great diffidence and with a single eye to European upland scenery in its actual climatic and geological conditions, we venture to propose the three classes of hill scenery, lower mountain scenery, and upper mountain scenery, only claiming possession of the first two for Great Britain. Hill scenery and lower mountain scenery would glide into each other in the Peak and the western Fells of Yorkshire. The Weald and Surrey would be unquestionably 'hill country,' and Cumbria mountainous. The debateable land beyond lower and upper mountain scenery would be found in one aspect of the question in the Black Forest and the Jura, and in the other in Lapland or Iceland, where, from the high latitude, the peculiar features of Alpine and Pyrenean mountains would find their correlatives at so comparatively insignificant an altitude above the sea.

Assuming then this terminology, what are the distinctive differences which at least as clearly mark off upper mountain from lower mountain scenery, as lower mountain is marked off from hill scenery, and which stamps Wordsworth's attempted parallel between the Lakes and Switzerland, to be as much a

wrong to the former as a comparison between them and the Weald would be to the latter? Vast tracts of everlasting snow, and black unvegetating rocks, are in themselves a distinctive feature, which preach their own existence on the housetops of the globe. In light and in shade, at morning and at evening, under blue skies and under cloud, when darkling and when rosy, the snow field asserts its own individual and peculiar value. Some traveller who had lived many years dreaming of, but never beholding a snowy mountain, and who rose at four on a cloudless summer morning, at Lucerne, to drink in the spectacle of which that town is the constant guardian, might, if such could be found, be appealed to in evidence of this assertion. Again, the glacier is a thing of itself, as much as the snow field, in the anatomy of landscape. Nothing that is not a glacier, can supply the place of a glacier, any more than anything else can supply the place of a lake, or a wood, or a torrent. Nothing else in temperate and tropical climates combines the white coloration, the broken outline, the blue crevasse. Frozen seas within the arctic and antarctic circles may offer similar phenomena, but high arctic latitudes lie out of the scope of this discussion. Mixing, too, as the Swiss glaciers do with the higher and with the lower types of beauty, now clinging to the bases of the topmost peaks, now shouldering through the woods, and tumbling into the pastoral and arable valleys, they are not merely a theoretical but a practical and constantly felt element of beauty.

But the snow field and the glacier, beautiful as they both may be, are but factors of that superior system of beauty which parts off the higher from lower mountain scenery. The existence of either under our actual atmospherical conditions, (postponing the question of former glaciers in our own mountains,) is the result of exceeding altitude, and in the existence of that altitude are involved those conditions of complication to which, after all, we must recur for the desired distinction.

A child, whose ideas of mountains may be derived from the table of comparative heights at the beginning of his atlas, in which the different summits are ranged in a row like so many sugar loaves, will simply take Mont Blanc to be a cone, of which the head happens to be four or five times taller than that of Snowdon. But sheer height is the very last thing which is perceptible in any upland region, except under very exceptional circumstances. Upwards of 15,000 feet of Mont Blanc, and nearly 15,000 of the Mischabel, indicate a vast and intricate region of ups and downs, clusters of peaks referable to the same base, valleys sloping away far out of sight, serpentine glens clogged up with torrent-like glaciers, and fenced by rifted

aiguilles, bristling heavenwards in savage prodigality, table-lands far above the snow level, and height upon height rising in complex augmentation each behind the other. Here is the secret. Upper mountain scenery is, by the nature of things, infinitely more complicated than that of regions whose highest peaks come below the snow line. The incidents of elevation, in the mountains of that country, are on such infinitely bigger and more intricate a scale, and the spectacle of range behind range presents itself under so undoubtedly grander an aspect, that comparison breaks down. Growing from the varying levels of rugged plateaus, and the frozen ice-streams, at all angles and all heights, crossing, overhanging, interlacing or underlying each other, are features so wholly foreign to Cumbria, or Wales, or even Scotland, that the comparison stultifies itself, in spite of Wordsworth's graceful argument about the fleecy clouds. In a word, his outburst is an excellent specimen of word-painting, but its value is not much as a canon of picturesque criticism. The result, so to speak, of comparative heights in Wales, Scotland, or Cumberland, is wholly made up of additions, for a difference of double or two-thirds is the utmost that can be predicated between the higher and more distinguishable heights in the same landscape. Upper mountain scenery calls in multiplication. In the Alps, with all the diminishing effects of distance and foreshortening, the broad fact remains behind, that one elevation may be, and often is, the multiple of another, the multiple being, of course, foreshortened behind the lesser height. But the inferior Skiddaw, Helvellyn, or Snowdon, is equally the victim of foreshortening behind the peaks which happen to occupy the foreground. Moreover, this proximate similarity of height checks the apparent infinitude of depth—range behind range—which can only find fair play under circumstances of great disparity of elevation. In one word, the excess of upper mountain, or Alpine over lower mountain, or Cumbrian measurement, and the existence on a gigantic scale of those striking natural phenomena, which owe their origin to congelation, are in themselves enough to justify the critics, who believe that they pay the best compliment to the sublimity of British mountains by not dragging them into contrast with the giants of continental Europe, and thereby setting up an impassable division between them and the bold hill scenery of many other regions of England.

We do not deny that there are many Alpine valleys in which the foreground conceals the loftier heights behind. Frequently too, when these elevations ought to be visible, the mountain fog blots them completely out of sight, and only leaves the lower peaks in sight. Then the landscape is reduced to the condition

of a lower mountain scene, and the points of superiority which the poet pleads for Cumbria may appropriately be admitted at their full value. The green meadows of Switzerland, and the trees in the valleys, walnut and plum, pear and apple, cultivated for their fruit-bearing qualities, must, in spite of the stateliness which the walnut so frequently attains, yield the palm of picturesque beauty to the heathery moor and the oak wood of the North. Autumn tints in Switzerland are, we believe, very rich, and the reddening leaf of the bilberry tones the scene. Still, the absence of summer heather (found, by the way, on the Italian side of the Alps) is a serious drawback. But, granting these limitations, the plain fact of the inherent superiority of Alpine scenery remains. Casual circumstances may equally elevate some effect of lower into a transitory equality with upper mountain scenery. An opportune snow storm may cap 'the mountain tops that freeze,' and then the tourist will do well to seize his advantage. Perhaps he may be even more daring, and imitate the clever, experienced mountaineers, who kept their Christmas gambols last year, (as registered in the *Saturday Review*,) by scrambling up snow-clad Snowdon, with rake handles by way of alpenstocks. The glowing description of their penman, written under the inspirations of fresh recollection, paints the spectacle which greeted them from the top of the wintry Welsh mountain, under the setting sun, as not inferior to several Continental panoramas of world-wide fame. We have no doubt that such was the case; but again, *exceptio probat regulam*, and although we hope that the example so given may swell the Christmas gains of landlords at Capel Curig and Grasmere, yet we cannot admit the casual grandeur of such an exceptional spectacle as overruling the plain facts of physical conformation. Though England may not possess its Alps, it owns richly, thanks alike to its physical and its political constitution, elements of rural and picturesque beauty in an abundance, which might well excite the envy of less happier lands. With what is confessedly our own let us continue to rest content.

ART. VII.—*Les Juifs en France, en Italie et en Espagne.* Par J. BÉDARIDE, bâtonnier de l'ordre des avocats à la cour impériale de Montpellier. Paris: Lévy Frères. 1859.

WE have long associated in our minds the idea that mediæval Spain was the home of true romance and chivalry: we have on the one hand the Christians doing glorious battle with the irresistible advance of the Mohammedan conqueror; on the other, we see the latter, in his turn, often manifesting a sense of honour and courtesy, which put to shame many a Christian knight. Besides these two, there comes between them a third, far too much overlooked in history, yet whose literary achievements ought to have placed him in a much higher rank than is ever accorded to him; to whom science and learning owe a debt, which they seem almost unwilling to pay,—we mean the Sephardim, or Spanish Jew, whose claims to the historian's notice have been overlooked or rudely thrust aside in favour of the other two, whom he so enriched, and who returned his benefits with such deep ingratitude. Spain, like Scotland, was once the land of the ballad and the song, which in long past days kept alive in that magnificent country the indomitable spirit of freedom, ever the most prized inheritance of the mountaineer. Who can read the glowing pages of 'The Cid,' or of Lockhart's 'Spanish Ballads,' even in their English dress, without being stirred to the very bottom of his soul? Who can listen to the legends of the Alhambra without revelling in imagination in all the glories of the sunny East? The very Arab conquerors caught something of the spirit of Christian chivalry; they even instituted orders of knights, they practised the tournament, they engaged in passages of arms, even with their Christian neighbours. Strange imitation! since there was ever lacking one thing, which constituted the very soul of Christian chivalry—the elevation of woman to her rightful position; a religion which degrades woman can never sustain real chivalry; and Moorish chivalry was at the best but a poor imitation of that native-born Christian institution.¹

¹ Let us say here, once for all, what is the meaning of the words 'Moor' and 'Arab?' The Arab conquered the whole of North Africa in the seventh century; the western part of Algeria, and what is now called Morocco, was then inhabited by the race of Mauritanians, or Mauri; from these came the word 'Moor,' still spelt in French 'Maure'; this is turned into the Spanish 'Moro' (as they have changed 'taurus' into 'toro,' and many other like words), from thence we get the word 'Moor.' The conquering Arab coming over to Spain from this country received

Besides this, the Spanish Moor achieved a further fame—he was an architect and a philosopher. From him the schoolmen got their Aristotle, and learned astrology, alchemy, and algebra. It is a curious question, and one well worth stopping to ask,—From whence did the Spanish Moor learn his science and his art? Why was it that the Spanish peninsula fostered a race of Ishmaelites so eminently superior to their brethren in other lands? The following pages will afford the true answer to these questions. At present, we shall only point out more strongly the singular fact of the isolation, as regards these matters, of the Spanish Moor. Separated by little more than twenty miles from the African coast, with which constant intercourse was kept up, there is no corresponding equality between the two members of the same race on the two opposite shores. We look in vain for learning between Tunis and Larache, such as Cordova or Granada afforded. No palace on the southern continent at all comes near the Alhambra of Granada, or the Alcazar of Sevilla; no mosque is to be for a moment compared

the name of the old inhabitant with whom the Spaniard has been so familiar. At the present day, the Arabs on the coast of Africa are still called by the French 'Les Maures,' while those in the interior are termed 'Les Arabes': the reason of this distinction is, that the Arabs expelled from Spain settled chiefly in the towns of the coast, principally for the purpose of trade; from their residence in Spain they were far more highly civilised than their African brethren, who were generally nomad tribes of Bedouins. The Kaballs and Berbers are, however, the true 'Moors,' being descended from the ancient Mauri, though they never now bear that designation. These latter, though adopting the Mohammedan religion, retain many of their old customs; e.g., there is far more equality between the sexes, the women (in the country) go unveiled, and work in the fields with the men; they live under independent chiefs, hardly owning the authority either of the Dey of Algiers, or, even now, of the Emperor of Morocco. It was these unfortunate wretches whom the French could not overcome in fair fighting; but, bent on entire conquest, proceeded to smoke them to death in the caves on Mount Atlas, where they had taken refuge. Of these also are the 'Riff pirates' of the present day, nominally subjects of the emperors of Morocco, but, in reality, independent.

The colour of the Moor is not black, as we have all learnt to suppose from 'Othello,' but in reality he is even fairer than the Spaniard: a young Moorish lady is as white and has as beautiful a bloom on her cheek as any lady in our own land. A black Othello is not, however, a mistake, since there were a great many negroes in the service of the Dey, chiefly slaves, but many freed men. No inconsiderable number of these were excellent sailors, powerful in body as well as bold and daring in action. The Arab or Moor is not, however, naturally a seaman nor a pirate: piracy was introduced into Africa by the Turk, who, up to the taking of Algeria, was the true corsair; the modern pirate, as we have said, is generally the Kaball or Berber. It is true that the Moor on his expulsion from Spain commenced a sort of petty piracy by capturing small Spanish trading vessels: but the true authors of Algerine piracy were the two brothers Aroudj and Khaïr-ed-Din, Turks by descent, natives of one of the islands of the Greek Archipelago, better known in European history as the brothers Barbarossa; the sepulchre of one of them is yet to be seen at Algier. A good account of these famous pirates will be found in *L'Algérie Ancienne et Moderne*, par M. Leon Galibert, Paris. It is amusing to see in this bulky volume, which is a really good history of Algier, French jealousy of England cropping out; for while the French conquest is blazoned forth with all *éclat*, Lord Exmouth's expedition, in 1816, only occupies one page.

to the Cathedral of Cordova, with its nineteen aisles, and eight hundred and thirty-four pillars; no mosque-tower like the Giralda of Sevilla, two hundred and fifty feet in height. On the contrary, the mosques and kasbahs of Morocco and Algier are generally poor things, those at Tangier especially so. The Kasbah of the Dey of Algier, and the Mosque at Tlemcen, are perhaps the finest of their respective kind, but they are very far behind their Spanish neighbours; even the houses in Andalusia are far superior to those in Africa, though both of them built after one fashion—the Moorish.¹

The solution of this enigma will be found, we think, in the fact, that there existed in Spain, long before the Moorish invasion, or even before the Gothic, large and powerful colonies of Jews, with schools and colleges superior to anything else in the Roman empire. They possessed a knowledge of astronomy, chemistry, and surgery, inherited from a long experience, which, if it had ever existed in the Roman empire, had been almost obliterated by the Northern invasions and conquests. We find, indeed, among the Jews generally, especially in Europe, a knowledge of drugs and medicines far exceeding that of the nations in which they were dispersed:² it was a knowledge often of immense value to the possessor, but often, too, the cause of frightful misery; for on the appearance of any contagious sickness, instead of calling in the aid of the Jew as a physician, when probably his skill and experience would have been of the greatest value, the populace, in almost every case, pursued exactly the contrary course; the universal voice clamoured for the expulsion of the physician for having caused the disease by poisoning the wells! And not content with mere expulsion, often were the miserable Jews murdered and plundered before they could effect their escape; as if the pouring out of their blood was to be a sort of libation to the demon of disease, to appease its wrath and obtain its removal. The immense wealth which the Jews accumulated by trade and usury, and which was imperceptibly enriching the

¹ The traveller will realize far more completely his dream of the 'East,' such as he learnt in childhood from the 'Arabian Nights,' by a visit to Southern Spain, than he will by one to Morocco, Algier, or Constantinople,—always excepting that he will not see the Oriental dress at the former, while he will at the latter; but the houses, with their marble floors and pillars, their fountains playing in the centre, their almost tropical plants, and the variegated lamps which hang from the galleries, create a charm, together with the unequalled climate, which realizes 'the East' far better than those places where the real Oriental is.

² It was no uncommon thing, as we shall show further on, for the court physician to be a Jew: one named Farragut was physician to Charlemagne. The same monarch employed another Jew, named Isaac, as an ambassador to the Khalif Haroun-al-Raschid; he returned with large presents, among which were an immense elephant and a clock.

country, was only another reason why they should be expelled. Rapacious rulers killed the goose, that they might get the golden eggs. While the Christian nations were engaged in ruinous wars or internal commotions, they had no time or opportunity to carry on trade; the Jew, taking no part in these quarrels, quietly got the greater part of commerce into his hands, and profited mightily. Covetous citizens and grasping nobles had no scruple in plundering the unbelieving Jew, the descendant of those who crucified their Lord; the bishops and clergy were not behind in fanning the flame of religious zeal to overwhelm the race which God had rejected and dispersed. When no epidemic was present to suggest the poisoning of wells, there was ever then the ready accusation that a Jew had murdered a Christian boy, to mix his blood in the Passover feast; or, out of pure spite, had crucified him, in imitation and mockery of the Christian's 'crucified God.'¹

¹ The beautiful 'Priores' Tale' in Chaucer, and the touching story of Sir Hugh of Lincoln, will occur to the memory of some of our readers. An old Scotch ballad, relating to a somewhat like event, where the scene is laid in 'Mirry-land,' is worth giving as a specimen of a very common belief of Jewish cruelty, though, we are confident, without foundation.

'The rain rins down through Mirry-
land Tounne,
Sae dois it downe the Pa:
Sae dois the lads of Mirry-land tounne
Quhan they play at the ba'.

'Then out and cam the Jewis dochter
Said "Will ye cum in and dine?"
"I winnae cum in, I cannae cum in,
Without my play-feres nine."

'Scho pou'd an apple reid and white
To intice the zong thing in:
Scho pou'd an apple white and reid
And that the sweit bairne did win.

'And scho has taine out a little penknife
And low down by her gair;
Scho has twin'd the zong thing, and
his life;
A word he never spak mair.

'And out and cam the thick, thick bluid,
And out and cam the thin,
And out & cam the bonny hert's bluid;
There was nae life left in.

'Scho laid him on a dressing borde,
And drest him like a swine,
And laughing said, "Gae now and play
With zour sweit play-feres nine."

'Scho row'd him in a cake of lead,
Bid him lie still and sleip.

Scho cast him in a deep draw-well,
Was fifty fadoms deip.

'Quhan bells wer rung, and mass was
sung,
And every lady went hame;
Then ilka lady had her zong sonne,
But Lady Helen had nane.

'Scho row'd hir mantil hir about,
And sair sair gan she weip;
And she ran into the Jewis castel,
Quhan they were all asleip.

"My bonny Sir Hew, my pretty Sir
Hew,
I pray thee to me speik."
"O Lady, rin to the deip draw-well
Gin ze zour sonne wad seik."

'Lady Helen ran to the deip draw-well
And knelt upon her kne:
"My bonny Sir Hew, an ze be here,
I pray thee speik to me."

"The lead is wondrous heavy, mither,
The well is wondrous deip,
A keen pen-knife sticks in my hert;
A word I dounae speik.

"Gae hame, gae hame, my mither deir,
Fetch me my winding sheet,
And at the back of Mirry-land tounne
Its thair we twa sall meet."

In old Scotch, the letter 'z' is always pronounced soft, as a 'y'; it is so still in many proper names. We have said the scene of this ballad is laid abroad, since there never was any 'Jewry' in Scotland. Mirry-land is probably Lombardy, in Dutch, Meylandt; the river Pa being the Po.

- It is a matter well worthy of notice, that when all the nations of Europe occasionally persecuted and expelled the Jews, Rome alone never did either: the ghetto was always a safe asylum for the dispersed of Israel.

It was not, however, only trade and commerce that the Jews engaged in; they were, in early times, agriculturists, cultivating the lands of those countries where they had located themselves. This is proved from a law of Charlemagne, which forbids Jews, as well as Pagans, to grant long leases, or to assume a title for the possession of land.¹ Indeed, it seems probable that the early settlements of Jews, in the East, was as much for the purpose of carrying on their ancestral employment of husbandry as for trade; that they were perforce driven into the latter through the constant danger of expulsion—personal property being more easily moved than real. We find many laws passed forbidding Jews to possess Christian slaves, and many also prohibiting intermarriages with Jews—so many, indeed, that we cannot help coming to the conclusion that, through, probably, covetousness, caused by the wealth of the Jew, was the frequent incitement to contract these marriages, yet his status must have been, in these early times, far better than it became afterwards. The Church had evidently great difficulty in maintaining its prohibition on this point.²

It is chiefly from these royal laws, and from the decrees of ecclesiastical councils, that we learn both the condition of the Jews, and their number and status in the first ten centuries of the Christian era: we are by this means very early introduced to the knowledge of the importance and influence of the Jewish element in Spain, to which country we are now going to direct our principal attention. In the Council of Eliberis (Elvira, near Granada), A.D. 324, which seems to be the first *National* Council in that country, we find the following canons, Can. xvi., 'The daughters of Catholics shall not be given in marriage to heretics, unless these shall submit themselves to the Catholic Church; the same is also decreed of Jews and Schismatics: since there can be no communion of one that

¹ 'Non liceat Christianis Judæorum neque paganorum res emphyteosis, vel conductionis titulo habere, neque suorum similiter eis accommodare.'—Additio iii. cap. xv.

² 'Nulli Christianorum vel Judæorum liceat matrimonium contrahere, nisi præmissa dotis promissione. Illud tamen observandum fore præcipimus ut si quis Christianus vel Christiana, aut Judæus vel Judæa nuptiale festum celebrare voluerint non aliter quam sacerdotali benedictione intra sinum sanctæ Dei ecclesiæ percepta, conjugium cuiquam ex his adire permittimus. Quod si absque benedictione sacerdotis quisquam Christianorum vel Hebreorum conjugium duxerit; aut centum principi solidos exsolvat, aut centum verberatus publice flagella suscipiat.'—Ad. iv. cap. ii. Before the sacerdotal blessing could be given the Jew or Jewess must abjure Judaism.

'believeth with an infidel; and if parents transgress this command, they shall be excommunicated for five years.'

Can. xlix. 'Landholders are to be admonished not to suffer the fruits which they receive from God with the giving of thanks, to be blessed by the Jews, lest our benediction be rendered invalid and unprofitable. If any one should venture to do so after this interdiction, let him be altogether ejected from the Church.'

Can. l. 'If any person, whether clerical, or one of the faithful, shall take food with the Jews, he is to abstain from our communion, that he may learn to amend.'

Can. lxxviii. 'If any one of the faithful, having a wife, shall commit adultery with a Jewess, or a Pagan, he shall be cast out from our communion.'

From Can. xlix. we shall probably be safe in concluding that, in these early times, the Jews in Spain held a considerable amount of landed property. The blessing of the Jews refers to a very beautiful litany said by them on their New Year's Day (in March), called the 'Great Hosannah at the New Year.' The response to each petition being 'Hosannah,' or 'Save us, we beseech Thee.'¹

This council is the first authentic mention we have of the Jews; we say authentic, because, according to Jewish accounts, there have been settlements in Spain since the time of Solomon; a marble sarcophagus is reported to have been discovered at Murviedro, the ancient Saguntum, inclosing an embalmed corpse, with an inscription in Hebrew to the following effect:— 'The sepulchre of Adoniram, the servant of King Solomon, who came hither to collect the tribute.' Supposing this to be a genuine monument, it only proves that some of the servants of King Solomon had visited Spain, and that one of them died and was buried there; but it does not prove that there was any settled colony. We know that Solomon joined Hiram in naval enterprises, and that Tarshish² was one of the places of trade;

¹ We give the first petition as a specimen:—

'O God, we beseech Thee, open Thy good treasures from Thy dwelling-place; and may the earth give her verdure. Hosannah.'

Each of the fruits are separately mentioned in the subsequent petitions, and abundance of each separately prayed for.

² The position of Tarshish is a well-known matter of dispute, the most probable is that of Tartessus in Spain; the common objection to this is, that Solomon imported from it 'ivory, apes, and peacocks.' We do not think this fatal to the supposition, for if North Africa be included in the general term, the difficulty is much lessened; for certainly elephants abounded in the country north of the Atlas, as we learn from their use in the Punic wars; apes are yet found in great plenty; and if 'peacock' be a name loosely given to any beautiful and rare bird, we can suppose the Bird of Paradise to be included in the category—a bird which is still found in the country between Constantine and Tunis. If these African products were first imported by the Phœnicians from their settlements in Africa to Tartessus, and then exported from thence to Palestine, the Scripture account will then be consistent with itself.

we know also that the Phœnicians traded in Spain ; it is, therefore, quite possible that some Israelites visited Spain in these early times, but we cannot believe in Jewish colonies. We may be pretty certain that there were large settlements of Jews in Spain before the Christian era ; such an important trading place is not likely to have been overlooked.¹ S. Paul's anxiety to visit that country seems to favour the supposition : of authentic accounts we have none.²

In the beginning of the fifth century Spain was overrun by the Suevi, the Alani, and the Vandals ; the old inhabitants, Iberians, took refuge in the mountains of Biscay and the north. Soon after, the Alani and Vandals were driven over the Straits of Gibraltar by the Visi, or Western Goths, and founded the kingdoms in North Africa, and afterwards Theoderic expelled also the Suevi, and established the Gothic supremacy in Spain. We need not follow out the bloody controversy between the Arians and Catholics, which ended in the elevation of the Catholic king Recared to the throne of Spain, and the confirmation of the Catholic doctrine at the Third Council of Toledo, in 589 A.D., more than to say that we have again canons forbidding Christians to intermarry with Jews, and the latter to possess Christian slaves. What was the condition of the Jews during these wars we have no record, except that they were better treated by the Arians than by the Catholics : we only know that they rejoiced to see the breaking up of the Roman Empire, applying to it all the prophecies against Edom, believing, on the authority of the Talmud, that Rome is intended under that name ;³ and further, seeing that Rome was the metropolis of the Church, as Constantinople was of the empire, by a very easy transition they applied to the Church the prophecies against Edom. In something of the like manner the Arab of North Africa now applies the name ' Roumia ' to all buildings and remains previous to his conquest of the country, by which he means, not Roman, in our sense of the word, but Christian.

After some years of civil war, in which two kings were killed, Sisebut assumed the regal power. He sent an embassy to Constantinople, concerning the possession of certain cities claimed

¹ That they were early acquainted with the riches of Spain, see 1 Mac. viii. 3.

² The document given by De Castro, as a letter from the synagogue of Toledo to Aunus and Caiaphas, recommending them not to put our Lord to death, is a manifest forgery. It was produced in times of persecution, in the hope that by affirming that the Spanish Jews were not implicated in the condemnation and crucifixion of our Lord, they would be more leniently treated by Christians.

³ Benjamin of Tudela, in his Itinerary, thus speaks of Rome : ' The mighty Rome, which is the metropolis of the Edomites. About two hundred Jews reside in this city, honourable men, who pay no tribute to any power whatever. Several are in the service of Pope Alexander, who is a very great prince, and chief of the Edomitish religion.'

by the Emperor of the East. Heraclius was then on the throne, who had lately quelled one of the most savage rebellions of the Jews, in which the latter had destroyed, as they thought, every vestige of Christianity in Jerusalem; all the churches, including the beautiful one of S. Helena in the Holy Sepulchre, had been demolished, and some ninety thousand Christians had perished. The feelings of the emperor were far from friendly toward the followers of the Law of Moses; besides, being much addicted to the study of astrology, he had been informed by the professors of that art, that his dominions, and even the Church itself, were in danger from the *circumcised race*. 'This,' says Mariana, 'which he ought to have understood of the Arabs, he believed to denote the Jews; wherefore he commenced persecuting the Jews in every way, and by all the means in his power.'¹ At this moment the Spanish ambassador arrived; the emperor urged upon the latter to impress upon his sovereign the necessity of expelling the Jews from the peninsula. Sisebut was quite ready to comply; he issued an edict offering baptism or confiscation and exile, as the only alternatives for the race of Israel. This harsh decree was condemned at the time by S. Isidore, and even Mariana in his history declares such a proceeding to be 'unlawful and forbidden.' Ninety thousand converts are reported to have been made; the number of exiles we are not told. How little this availed we may learn from the fact that in less than twenty years after (A.D. 633), at the Council of Toledo, at which S. Isidore presided, no less than nine canons were enacted respecting the Jews; the first of them expresses disapprobation of forced conversions, but requires that such Jews as have received the sacrament shall continue in the belief and practice of Christianity.

We need not notice other councils; they all repeat the same style of canons, showing clearly how little effect all the forced conversions had on the faith of the Jew. One feature of the case we cannot pass over, for it is a striking instance of the invincible effect of persecution, whether in a good cause or a bad one; it is this, that numbers of Christians were continually embracing Judaism, both in France and Spain. Our author gives a curious instance in the former country:—

'Les conversions au Judaïsme n'étaient pas sans exemple. Plusieurs Chrétiens, parmi lesquels on citait un diacre du Palais, nommé Putho, avaient quitté l'Eglise pour embrasser le Judaïsme.'—P. 85.

The afflictions laid upon the Jews by these councils may be summed up thus: Jewish infants, at seven years old, to be taken away from their parents and educated as Christians; their

¹ Mariana. Libro Quinto, Capitulo III. Mohammed had then just commenced his mission.

heathen slaves to be emancipated by receiving baptism, and their wives divorced; Hebrew books to be destroyed; Hebrew festivals to be discontinued; circumcision prohibited; not allowed to hold public offices; their evidence not to be accepted in court; every Jew to be registered and inspected annually by the bishop; a sort of passport-system in case of travelling:—infraction of these rules to be punished by confiscation, with exile or death, unless the offender submitted to baptism. We may well inquire, How could Judaism continue to exist for the one hundred and twenty years of Catholic Gothic rule? Had the canons and laws really been carried out, existence as a separate people, with a distinctive religion, would have been impossible: we must, therefore, suppose that there were many priests, as well as many judges, who allowed the laws to lie unexecuted, and secretly connived at Jewish existence; probably Jewish gold will account for the fact still further. The time was, however, now at hand, when a complete deliverance from the Gothic yoke was to free the Jew from all religious persecution, and was to allow him to cultivate literature and learning till he far exceeded all Christian nations of the West; till Jewish Spain rivalled, if it did not surpass, that home which European literature yet found, when it had been expelled elsewhere by northern barbarism—Byzantium.

Before the end of the seventh century, about eighty years from the Hedjra, the Arabs had subdued the whole of North Africa; the Vandal kingdoms fell, and have not left a trace of Christianity behind them. In no country has Christianity been so obliterated as in the land famous for such names as S. Augustine and S. Cyprian. In no country have Christian monuments so universally disappeared.¹ In 710 the like fate seemed about to fall upon Spain: Taric, the Mohammedan leader under Musa, landed near Calpe, which he took, and named after himself, Ghebel-taric, the Mountain of Taric, now called Gibraltar. The Christian host under Roderic met the invaders on the plains of Jerez;² the battle lasted three days;

¹ Let it be remembered that the Vandals were Arians, and persecutors of the Catholics, and perhaps we may understand the moral of the Christian overthrow.

It is unaccountable that there are so few Christian remains in Algeria, when Roman (heathen) ones are numerous. There are the remains of a church and extensive Christian graveyard, extending over some acres of ground, at Tipassa, near Cherchell (the ancient Julia Cæsarea), which we think would well repay longer and closer investigation than we were able to give it when we visited the place. Tipassa is famous for the miracle of its forty martyrs—a miracle which even Gibbon admits as unassailable. Gibbon, *Hist.* ch. xxxvii. 4.

² We shall throughout this article adopt the modern Spanish orthography, as it is now authoritatively fixed. The letter *z* (equis) is now never used except in such words as are followed with a *c*, in which case it retains the sound of our English *z*. In all other cases, where it had the sound of an aspirated guttural, it is replaced by the letter *j* (jota). We have therefore written Jerez instead of the old Xerez.

on the third, the exhausted and almost conquered Saracens were rallied by their leader for one last effort; Taric himself fiercely charging reached the car of Roderic, and pierced him with his lance. This decided the day: most of the Gothic nobility having fallen as well as their king, the Christians fled on all sides, and the successful leader reduced town after town, in which he placed small garrisons of Arabs, supplementing them with Jews whom he found there. At Toledo the Jews opened the gates to the conqueror.¹ Soon was the whole of Spain overrun by the Arab invaders, till the Gothic inhabitants were forced to take refuge in the mountains of Asturias, as they had, years before, compelled the ancient inhabitants, the Iberians, to do in those of Biscay.

We are not, however, to suppose that all the Christians fled from the land now conquered by the Mohammedan; on the contrary, we find that large numbers remained, and were allowed full exercise of their religion. Mariana informs us that, at Cordova, 'the Moors at the conquest had granted full liberty to the Christian religion; and that, especially in that city, were to be seen publicly the priests, monks, nuns, in their several habits. Within the walls were the monasteries of Aciscus the Martyr, S. Zoilus, S. Faustus, S. Januarius, and S. Martial,' besides three churches; and without the walls were eight monasteries. He tells us also, that bells were allowed to be rung, and the exercise of religion not hindered, save that Christians were forbidden to enter the mosques, or to blaspheme their prophet.² In fact, from all that we can gather, we imagine that the Christians continued to be the majority of the inhabitants; they soon seem to have lost their own language, and to have spoken only Arabic;³ and so completely did they fall into Arab customs, that before long they practised circumcision, and abstained from pork and wine. These habits went on increasing, till at last, in after years, they entirely apostatized; for on the reconquest of Spain in the fifteenth century, there was not a

Even our old friend Don Quixote has undergone some transformation; he appears now as Don Quijote, pronounced Kehoté, the *j* pronounced as a guttural aspirate. *Ch* is sounded like the English; *z* (theta) like our *th*; *ll* and *ñ* have a liquid sound, as if followed by an *i*; and *g* is an aspirated guttural before *e* and *i*. The Spaniards confess that they have borrowed the sound of the jota from the Arabs.

¹ Roderic, Archbishop of Toledo, relates this fact: he adds further, 'Taric autem ex Arabibus quos secum duxerat, et Judæis quos Toleti invenerat, munivit Toletum.' Again, 'Judæos autem qui inibi morabantur cum suis Arabibus ad populationem et custodiam Cordubæ demiserunt.' Granada was committed to the Jews alone; on account of their number, it was called by the Arabs 'Jews' town.'

² Mariana. Libro Septimo, Capitulo XV.

³ Christians who talked only Arabic were called 'young Arabs; in Spanish, Mozarabians, from *Moro*, a young man. Hence the 'Mozarabic Liturgy.' The Bible and the Book of Canons were also translated into Arabic for the use of the clergy, for few of them could understand Latin.

single Christian to be found in some of the larger cities. The same rule was applied to the Spanish Christians under Mohammedan rule as was, until the publishing of the Hattihoumayoun in Constantinople, in 1857, that in the whole Mohammedan empire, viz, Christians were governed by their own laws, under their own governors, who settled all internal disputes, and were permitted the exercise of their own religion; the Mohammedans not interfering unless the case concerned one of themselves.

We must now pause a moment in our history to inquire into the causes which brought the Arab host into Spain, for they are deeply connected with our subject. Ballads and romances have attributed the invasion to Count Julian, whose daughter King Roderic had seduced; and to revenge his dishonour the count invited the Moors to join him in a rebellion against the king. Whatever truth there may be in this story—and we are not disposed to question the existence of a substratum of truth—yet we cannot give it the importance its narrators claim for it; we shall find the true cause years further back, in the persecutions of the Jews.

Banishment or baptism being the two alternatives offered to the unfortunate sons of Israel, many chose the former; they passed over to the shores of Africa, and there prospered under Arab domination. Left at full liberty to exercise their religion, and to carry on trade, their condition naturally excited in the breasts of their less fortunate brethren a desire that such a happy condition might one day be theirs, even while living within the borders of Spain; for they clung to their adopted country with a like obstinacy, and almost a like affection, that their forefathers had to Palestine. They conceived, therefore, the idea of an Arab conquest to secure their own liberty, and to avenge themselves of their oppressors; offering to the latter the rich and magnificent plains of Andalusia and the gardens of Granada as their reward; nothing doubting that they who had so easily subdued the Vandal kingdoms of Africa, could, with equal facility, conquer also the Gothic kingdom of Spain. In confirmation of this statement we read that, sixteen years before the battle of Jerez, King Egica summoned the Seventeenth Council of Toledo, in which summons we find mention made that these Hebrews 'have plotted with others beyond the sea' to deliver up Catholic Spain to the infidel. This council, instead of relaxing the chains which other councils had forged for the unhappy Israelites, goes further, and offers only two alternatives—the acceptance of Christianity by the whole people, or a cutting them off by the 'scythe of justice.' They again decreed that all children of seven years old should be taken from their parents, brought up as Christians, and be married to

Christians; circumcision and Jewish observances again prohibited. This filled up the measure of Jewish endurance; renewed communications with their brethren in Africa, and through them with the Mohammedans, followed, and, when all was ripe, the Moorish host appeared, and Spain fell,—an event not only brought about in the first instance, but helped on in subsequent stages, by the Jews. That they were numerous there is no doubt; so numerous, that they were employed by the Arabs to garrison their captured towns. We may account for these large numbers—almost incredible, considering the constant persecutions—partly by supposing that the decrees were not fully carried out, in some cases through leniency, still more through the influence of Jewish bribes; and partly by supposing that the forced converts would, on the first appearance of victory, throw off their fictitious Christianity, and assume openly their secretly cherished Judaism. However it was, Taric found numerous and valuable allies in every town he besieged, and a ready-made garrison in every town he took. Generally the Jew used his newly-bestowed liberty with moderation and gratitude: in one instance, however, fanaticism got the better of prudence, and a certain Jew, named Serenus, proclaimed himself the Messiah, and called upon his countrymen to join his standard and restore the kingdom in the Holy Land. Numbers flocked to him, and, leaving all their possessions and their newly-acquired freedom, set sail under his guidance. What became of the enterprise is unknown, but we may conclude from the silence of history that it perished.¹ The great majority, on the other hand, used well the privileges allowed them by the Moors: not only did they enlarge their commerce, not only did they introduce improvements in agriculture, and especially in irrigation, so as to increase in Granada and Andalusia the riches of the soil, till they became like a vast garden; not only did they decorate their synagogues, and celebrate their feasts with blowing of trumpets and rejoicings, unknown for centuries under Gothic rule; but they now cultivated literature and learning, till their schools and their Rabbins became far more famous than those of older time at Tiberias and Babylon, and excelled the Christian universities of France and Italy. In truth, the Moorish domination of the Spanish peninsula was the Golden Age of Jewish learning; nor shall we be at all exaggerating if we affirm, that it was from the Jews that the Spanish Moors obtained their taste for literature; and that from their works,

¹ Besides this man there were several others, both in the East and West, who gave themselves out to be the Messiah; a brief notice of whom will be found in Basnage, liv. ix. ch. xi. Mr. Disraeli has made one, David Alroi, or Eldavid, A.D. 1200, a native of Persia, the hero of a novelette. Basnage tells us a curious story of an Arab of Fez, who proclaimed himself the precursor of the Messiah.

and in their schools, they learnt those accomplishments, and acquired that civilisation, which has ever made that marked contrast between the Arab of Spain and his brother of Africa.

In the middle of the tenth century, a persecution by the Khalif Kader broke up and dispersed the celebrated schools of Babylon: two Rabbin, Moseh and Hanoc, escaping the general wreck, found their way to Spain; and there, in 948, founded at Cordova a college, which was ere long destined to surpass its oriental parents, and fix its daughter schools in France and Italy, as well as in other places in Spain. In these, besides the exposition of the Scripture, treatises on the Talmud, researches in the Kabbala, we find there were taught medicine, astronomy, moral philosophy, as well as the lighter pursuits of music and poetry. The professors of Cordova obtained, we are told, by the unanimous voice of Europe, the title of 'Sapientissimi.' A writer in the fifteenth century ('Branch of David') affirms that every day from Cordova there rode out seven hundred Israelites in seven hundred chariots, all arrayed in royal apparel, and crowned with tiaras, after the custom of the Hagarene (Arab) nobles. Perhaps we must make allowance here for a little oriental exaggeration.

Even in the East, it would seem that the Arab was indebted to the Jew for an introduction to secular literature; for the early Mohammedan conquerors were too much taken up with warfare to attend to literature, and too fanatic to allow it to flourish. If the well-known saying of the Khalif Omar be true, which consigned to flames the celebrated library of Alexandria—that if the books were in accordance with the Khoran, they were useless; if contrary to it, were pernicious, and ought to be destroyed,—we shall see that learning had little chance of making progress. The Fatmahite Khalifs were persecutors of the Jews, so was Omar; but his successors were not: under the protection of the latter, the dispersed Rabbin of Sora and Pumbeditha resumed their teaching and their schools.

'We see them give themselves up to study with ardour, and open the career of the sciences to the Arabs. The first book written in Arabic was in fact the work of a Jew.

'Masser Javaich, a Syrian Jew, translated the Medical Pandects of Aaron, an Alexandrian priest, from Syrian into Arabic; and this work found numerous imitators.

'Following the example of the translator of Aaron, the Jews and Nestorians¹ of the school of Gondisapor set themselves to transport among the Arabs the rich heritage of Greek literature: the works of Hippocrates, Discorides, Plato,

¹ It is a singular feature in the history of the Jews, that while persecution was the general characteristic of the Catholics, the former lived in peace and harmony with heretics. Equally singular it is, that while the Orthodox Mohammedan (Sonnite) were their protectors, the Shiite of Persia and the sectarians of the west were persecutors.

Aristotle, succeeded the translation of Aaron; and, from that period, the Arabs, imbued with the taste for knowledge, prepared works which, several centuries later, contributed to make known in the West these luminaries.

'The establishment of the Arabs in Spain is one of the most important events which the history of the middle ages affords. We date from that time the commencement of a new era for the Jews, and a memorable one for learning. . . . This [patronage of learning] commenced under the dynasty of the Abassides.'—Pp. 66, 67.

With such ardour was literature pursued, that even the supposed inferiority of woman was overlooked; for while literary meetings were held in rose gardens, and beside fountains of water, where warriors recited their poetry, and students strove for prizes for eloquence, there was at Sevilla a college for women, from whence proceeded many whose name and fame posterity has preserved. Abderhahman had a female secretary named Moyna; Ayesha, noted for her beautiful handwriting, compiled books for her own and the khalif's library; and Waladata, daughter of the Khalif ûl-Hakem, has left behind her specimens of poetry, which prove that she was no mean proficient in the art. In this, as in other things, the Arab was preceded by the Jew, for we read of a daughter of the Prince of the Captivity giving public lectures on the Talmud; and, fearing that her beauty might inspire other feelings than the love of knowledge, she delivered her lectures sitting behind a lattice.

Again:—

'The Jews in France and Italy were not slow to avail themselves of the literary riches of those in Spain; the study of medicine was established among them, as among the Spanish Jews; and afterwards, in the ninth century, the principal physicians of France and Italy were Jews.'—P. 95.

In France, the schools of Narbonne and Lunel were the most famous; there were others at Beziers and Montpellier; in Italy, that of Salerno stands first. Montpellier became afterwards the most celebrated of all the schools of France for medicine. Though the language used in these schools was principally Hebrew, and the scholars Jews, we find occasionally a Christian pupil in those of Spain; we may mention particularly Gerbert, Archbishop of Rheims, then of Ravenna, who was afterwards elected Pope, under the name of Sylvester II.; for his scientific knowledge was so far in advance of the age, that he did not escape from the suspicion of magic.¹

This superior learning of the Jews, as well as their administrative abilities, raised them to high offices in the courts of the

¹ Some of our readers will be, perhaps, surprised to learn, that there once existed a Jewish school, synagogue, and burial-place at Oxford; whether the former was attached to the University or not is not clear: the buildings were removed by Cardinal Wolsey to make room for Christ Church; the cemetery is included in the grounds of the Botanical Gardens. See Ant. & Wood, '*Hist. Oxon.*' vol. II. pt. ii. p. 745.

Khalife of the West. It was through Bar-Khasdai,¹ the confidential adviser to Abderhahman, and Ben Isaac Israeli, a famous physician, that the Jews obtained so many privileges: even the Christian kings of Spain forgot the persecuting decrees of their predecessors, and admitted Jews to high offices in the state, that of royal physician being generally one.

We even find Alfonso VIII., surnamed 'the Good,' granting to Jews in the Charter of Cuença the rights of citizenship, putting them on an equality with Christians. This favour, which was really owing to the king's respect for the superior learning and talents of the Jews, gave rise to a discreditable story, that he was influenced by an unlawful affection for a beautiful Jewess, who, like Esther, procured favour for her people. S. Ferdinand, of Castilla, was the king who did most for the Israelites. When he had conquered the greater part of Andalusia, he allowed the Rabbin of Cordova to transfer themselves and their college to Toledo, as being a more central position from which might flow more easily the stream of learning to other places. When his son, Alfonso X., surnamed 'the Learned,' composed his astronomical books, known as the 'Alfonsine Tables,' two Jews of Cordova, as well as fifty others, brought at high salaries from the Jewish schools in France, assisted the learned Moors in composing the work.

We noticed the curious fact that, during the severe persecutions of the Jews, many Christians judaized; we find the equally unexpected fact that, in the Golden Age of Jewish learning and toleration, several eminent, and many ordinary Jews became, of their own free will, Christians. Among the former was Moses Tsadik, who, on his baptism at Husca, A.D. 1106, received the name of Peter Alonso, the king, Alonso I., standing his godfather. He wrote a learned treatise against Judaism, and another against Mohammedanism—works which are said to have much encouraged conversions from these two bodies. The celebrated commentator, Nicholas de Lyra, was a converted Jew; we find others mentioned, whose learning gained them promotion to bishoprics, both in Spain and Italy.

We could easily fill up the remaining space of this article

¹ It is from an embassy sent to Constantinople by this minister, that we learn the fact of the existence of the curious kingdom of Kosar, the head of which was always a king professing Judaism, though not always a Jew by descent. The history of the establishment of Judaism as the national religion is curious: a certain ruler, finding his dominions containing Christians, Jews, Mohammedans, in nearly equal proportions, secretly asked the former if Judaism were not better than Mohammedanism? they replied it was. Asking the like question of the Mohammedans, viz. if Judaism was not better than Christianity, and receiving also an answer in the affirmative, he concluded, with something like a mathematical calculation, the superiority of Judaism. Basnage doubts the existence of this kingdom, but subsequent discovery has established its certainty.

with lists of the names and works of Jewish authors, were such a catalogue consistent with our plan; a tolerably good *resumé* of these will be found by the curious in the work we have placed at the head of this article, also in Mr. Finn's 'Sephardim.' There are a few names, however, which we must not pass over; most of them will be familiar to those acquainted with Bishop Patrick's Commentary, Leigh's *Critica Sacra*, or Lightfoot's works. R. Solomon Jarkhi, called also Rashi,¹ is styled among his countrymen the *Prince of Commentators* (twelfth cent.); he visited his countrymen in Europe and Asia, even as far as Russia and Tartary, where he collected every kind of Rabbinical lore. Abraham Aben Ezra, surnamed *the Wise*, was a writer on astronomy, philosophy, medicine, poetry, and grammar, besides being a commentator on Scripture. His commentary on the Book of Job is particularly valuable on account of his knowledge of Arabic. He takes the Arabic translation of R. Saadiah, surnamed *Gaon* (the excellent), master of the Babylonian schools in the seventh century, as his text. It was Aben Ezra who first divided the globe into two hemispheres by inventing the equator. We see from this that the true theory of the earth was known to the Jewish Rabbin long before the time of Galileo; probably the true knowledge had never been lost. 'In the Book of Chamouna the Aged, *i.e.* in the Book of Zohar,' writes M. Frank,² 'we learn from frequent explanations, that the earth turns round itself in a circle; that one portion of the inhabitants are on the upper surface, the other is on the under; that all creatures change the point of sight, according to the aspect of each place, though keeping throughout the same position; that while one country of the earth is enlightened, there are others in darkness: to the one is day, to the other night; and there are lands where it is constantly day, or at least the night continues but a few moments.'

We shall hardly be making a rash conjecture when we say that this knowledge mounted up far beyond the time of the author of the Book of Zohar, for it may be found in Job (xxvi. 7): 'He hangeth the earth upon nothing.' Like others of the Rabbin, he relieved the weariness of study by the lighter literature of poetry, and also by the intellectual amusement of chess. Aben Ezra combined these two together; he wrote a poem on chess, in which the game is played out in rhymes, moral reflections frequently attending each move. On *check-mate* we have the following: 'For his [the king's] sake all

¹ The Jews gave abbreviated names to the great Rabbin by taking the first letters of their names, interposing vowels, thus forming a word: here *R* stands for Rabbi, *S*, for *Sh*, for Solomon, and *J* for Jarkhi.

² De la Cabale. The book of Zohar was written in the first century.'

‘ the troops are slain, and the redemption of his life is equivalent to theirs, the glory is gone, and they are no more his subjects, for their lord is slain; but, nevertheless, they may fight another battle, and those who are slain may be revived.’ He also wrote some kabbalistic works. He died about A.D. 1174. Chess was a favourite game both with Arabs and Jews, both of whom have left works on the subject both in Hebrew and Arabic. Draughts are constantly played in the cafés in Algier to this day.

Three Kimkhi, father and two sons, all learned writers, of whom David is the most celebrated (called Radakh), born at Narbonne, which then belonged to Spain: he is well known as a commentator, especially on the Psalms and Isaiah. He is, perhaps, the first who introduced criticism into a Biblical commentary. He flourished at the end of the twelfth century. R. Moses Bar Nachman (called Ramban), born about the same time, was a devoted student in Kabbalism; his commentaries are consequently chiefly allegorical. R. Levi Ben Gersom, called Ralbag, a physician by profession, wrote also commentaries; unlike the former, his expositions are literal rather than allegorical: he died A.D. 1370. R. Isaac Abarbanel, born at Lisbon, A.D. 1437, received the rank of *Don* from Alfonso V. of Portugal; he was, however, obliged to fly from the persecutions of the successor of his patron, and died at Venice. He, too, has left valuable commentaries.¹

We have deviated a little from chronological order, in not having mentioned sooner the great Maimonides: we have done so, because we intend to give him a longer notice. R. Moses Ben Maimon (called Rambam) is sometimes mentioned as Moses the Egyptian, on account of his long residence in that country; he was, however, born at Cordova, in A.D. 1131. He claims a long line of illustrious ancestors, being descended from R. Jehudah Hakkodosh (the Holy), the compiler of the Mishna, and therefore of the royal line of David. Instructed by his father in Scriptural and Talmudical lore, he added also a large amount of Gentile learning, being familiar with the writings of Plato, Aristotle, Themistius, Galen, and other philosophic and medical works, especially the latter. His disinterested friendship for the illustrious Arabian, Averroë, caused his exile from his native country; for Averroë was accused of defection from the Mohammedan faith, and was consequently deposed from his office of chief magistrate at Cordova. Maimonides was suspected of a leaning toward the doctrines of Islam—a groundless suspicion, founded on his friendship for Averroë—and had to fly from

¹ Most of the commentaries mentioned above will be found accompanying the great Bibles published by Bomberg and Buxtorf.

the persecution of his own countrymen. He came to Cairo; where he was made court physician to Alphardel, the Khalif. In a letter to R. Samuel Aben Tybbon, he thus describes his daily life:—‘ I generally visit the sultan [khalif] every morning; and when either he, or his children, or his wives, are attacked with any disorder, I am detained in attendance the whole day; or when any of the nobility are sick, I am ordered to visit them. But, if nothing prevent, I repair to my own habitation at noon; where I no sooner arrive, exhausted and faint with hunger, than I find myself surrounded with a crowd of Jews and Gentiles, nobles and peasants, judges and tax-gatherers, friends and enemies, eagerly expecting the time of my return. Alighting from my horse, I wash my hands, according to custom; and then, courteously and respectfully saluting my guests, entreat them to wait with patience while I take some refreshment. Dinner concluded, I hasten to inquire into their various complaints, and to prescribe for them the necessary medicines. Such is the business of every day. Frequently, indeed, it happens that some are obliged to wait till evening; and I continue for many hours, and even to a late hour of the night, incessantly engaged in listening, talking, ordering, and prescribing, till I am so overpowered with fatigue and sleep that I can scarcely utter a word.’¹

By his influence with the khalif, he was allowed to found an academy at Alexandria, which soon became famous, drawing students from Egypt, Syria, and other parts of the East. This school was afterwards broken up by the fanaticism of the Mohammedans, who compelled many Jews to apostatise.

His great fame rests upon his writings on the Mosaic Law and the Talmud. In the latter, he distinguishes between the decisions of the judges and the legends or stories which illustrate the law or the judgments—a distinction of immense importance at the time, as the two matters being confused together in the Talmud, there was a tendency to make them of equal authority; thus, as it were, setting the seal of authority on the wildest extravagancies of Oriental imagination. This work is called *Jad Hakhazakah*, ‘The Strong Hand;’ or *Mishneh Torah*, ‘The Mishnical Law.’ The other work, still more celebrated, is the *Moré Nevochim*, ‘Ductor dubitantium;’ it is a critical, philosophical, and theological work, in which are explained the ceremonies, parables, allegories, and difficult passages in the Old Testament. It is his last work—excepting his transcription of the Pentateuch—written, in Arabic, when he was fifty years

¹ See a translation of a portion of the *Moré Nevochim*, by Dr. Townley. London, Longman, 1827. To which is prefixed some valuable dissertations, and a life of Maimonides.

of age. It was afterwards translated by his pupil, Aben Tybbon, under his own eye, into Hebrew. This book threw the world of Jewish Rabbins into consternation, and divided it into two parties, one which made no distinction between the authority of the legends and judgments in the Talmud, and the other which followed the distinction made by Maïmonides. The question came to an issue at Montpellier, where R. Solomon, then president of the schools, with other Rabbins, violently opposed the principles of the book, and declared its author excommunicate. The synagogue of Narbonne replied by anathematizing R. Solomon. To settle the question, R. David Kimkhi was sent to consult the synagogues of Spain; which, taking part against Solomon, established the authority of Maïmonides. The dispute was not finally settled till 1232.¹

His last work was the transcription of the Pentateuch, with his own hand, from a copy written before the destruction of Jerusalem, in order to preserve the true version from the many corruptions which disfigured the copies then in use. It is also said that he visited Chalons, in Burgundy, where he obtained a copy written by the hand of Ezra, which he found to agree with his own in every particular. He died in 1205, aged seventy; a fast of seven days was proclaimed in the synagogues—in which even the Mohammedans joined—where 1 Sam. iv. 1, to the words ‘the ark of the Lord is taken,’ was appointed to be read: he was buried at Tiberias, some say Hebron. The admirers of this great man may perhaps be pardoned, if they, like their Christian contemporaries, relate some miraculous events which attended his death. The funeral procession, we are told, was attacked by robbers, and dispersed; when the latter were about to throw the coffin into the sea, it was found immovably fixed to the ground, and so remained until the return of the bearers, who then were enabled to commit the remains of the great Rabbi to his last resting-place. Maïmonides, to this day, holds a place in the estimation of the Jew above all other Rabbinical writers. ‘From Moses to Moses there never has arisen one like unto Moses,’ is become a proverb.

We must not pass over another remarkable character, Benjamin of Tudela, the famous traveller. Setting out from Navarre in 1160, he visited the principal places in Europe, Asia, and Africa, where his own countrymen were chiefly located. At

¹ A sect of Karaites arose in Spain, partly in consequence of Maïmonides having thus shaken the faith of many in tradition. Aben-Alphraz was their principal defender; their great opponent was Abraham Ben David Halevi, who obtained from King Alfonso a decree against the anti-traditionists, with complete success, for the latter were silenced; the dispute and victory of the Talmudists caused a still stronger enthusiasm in favour of tradition, which in a great measure neutralized the good that Maïmonides had done.

each place he notes down the number and condition of the Jews whom he found there; and so long as he relates what he himself saw and observed, we believe him trustworthy; further than this we cannot go. Credulous to the last degree, he records all that was told him, and accepts all legends as true; in this matter it is not impossible for us to make a pretty accurate distinction between the legend and the history; *e. g.*, in speaking of Kharran, he says,—‘Which place was indeed the home of our father Abraham, but no edifice now remains. . . . Twenty miles from Babylon reside twenty thousand Jews, who worship in synagogues, or in that high chamber, which Daniel the prophet built for himself of hewn stones and brick; there is also a synagogue and the palace of Nebuchadnezzar, and the furnace into which were cast Ananias, Misael, and Azarias.’ Here we may fully believe that these places were shown to Benjamin, and that those that showed them believed that they were the places which they described; but we may safely doubt that fact of Daniel having built the identical chamber, or that the palace of Nebuchadnezzar and the fiery furnace had escaped the general ruin of Babylon. When, too, he records statements of the wealth and greatness of Jews in other countries than those he visited, and wonderful tales of Gentile nations whom he never saw, we must be permitted to consign such to the like category in which we place those marvels of our own countryman, Sir John Mandeville. It is on account of these fabulous stories that Dr. E. Clarke and the cautious Basnage have expressed their belief that Benjamin had never quitted his native country. We see no sufficient ground for supposing him to have been an impostor, or to have deliberately written fiction; for without doubt the Jews were the greatest travellers of those times—they visited their own countrymen in every land. On the authority of Benjamin, we find that a person calling himself the Prince of the Captivity yet lingered at Babylon, where the fame of its former glory had not died away; and many of the Western Jews were anxious to visit the country so famous for learning, the residence of the (supposed) last prince of the house of David, and the birthplace of the Talmud, and the cradle of learning. We only regret that more of those pilgrims did not record what they saw and heard.

We remarked above, that, during the Golden Age of Jewish learning and wealth, when Christian monarchs were too weak, or perhaps too prudent, to put in force the sanguinary decrees of their predecessors, or of the ecclesiastical councils, many Jews were converted to Christianity. One in particular deserves a passing notice, not only on account of his own learning and eloquence, but on account of his great success in converting others of his

own countrymen. This was Joshua Lorki, who, on his baptism, took the name of Jeronimo de Santa Fé. His conversion and success so exasperated the unbelieving Jews, that they, making a word out of the initials of his name, called him Halorki, the Blasphemer. Pedro de Luna, the Spanish anti-pope (Benedict XIII.), whose physician he was, desiring at once to hear Jeronimo, and, if possible, to make a large number of converts, invited the most eminent Jews to a public disputation, in which Jeronimo undertook to prove from the Talmud that the Messiah had come. The disputation commenced February 7, 1413, and lasted till November of the following year, the anti-pope presiding, either in person or by deputy. The discussion was carried on in Latin, and the Jews seem to have been treated with perfect fairness, and the disputation conducted with impartiality. The result was that all the Jews who had disputed against Jeronimo, excepting two, confessed themselves to be conquered in the contest, and embraced Christianity. These were followed by about fifteen hundred more, who acted on the example of their Rabbi. The victors sullied their triumph by issuing decrees in the spirit of the old Spanish Councils of Toledo, whereby thousands were compelled to be baptized.¹

We may also mention another learned Jew who was converted to the Christian faith, Solomon Halevi; he is said to have been convinced by the reading of the treatise '*De legibus*,' by S. Thomas Aquinas. He took holy orders, and was successively Bishop of Cartagena, and Archbishop of Toledo; he, too, was instrumental in convincing many Jews and Moors, and drawing them into the Church.

The period of Jewish liberty was now fast passing away; the arms of the Christians were slowly gaining ground, and surrounding the one remaining Moorish kingdom of Granada: with the reconquest of Spain came the reimposition of persecuting statutes. These were imposed only by degrees, for we find even as late as 1474 the assessment of the kingdom of Castilla in the hands of a Jew, Jacob Aben Muñoz, King Henry IV.'s physician and chief judge, while many of the proscribed nation held important offices in the state. War had exhausted not only the exchequer of the king, but the means of the peasant; commerce among the Spaniards there was scarcely any, agriculture was neglected, and there was little gold or silver current in the country, for America had not yet poured in her unbounded wealth on the fortunate discoverer; in fact, most

¹ We are well aware that Jews have given a different version of this famous disputation; they attribute the conversions to the decrees of the council, not to the eloquence of Jeronimo. We have followed De Castro's account, and as he quotes authentic documents, we see no reason to discredit him.

of the gold and silver was in the hands of the Jews, and they durst only use it by stealth, for fear of being plundered by the people. Even the Moorish kingdom was imitating the Christian ones in oppressing the Jew, and depriving him of the liberty he formerly possessed. Portugal alone granted them full liberty, which lasted until the end of the fifteenth century, during which time the celebrated Abarbanel held the office of minister of finance. Many Jews emigrated from Spain to the former country, where Raban Eliezer established printing presses, from which issued an abundance of works in Hebrew, among which was an edition of the Pentateuch with the Chaldee paraphrase, and the Commentary of Rashi. The typography is beautiful.

We must now hasten to a close: Ferdinand and Isabella, having united the Spanish Christian kingdoms under one crown, determined on expelling from Spain the last remnant of Moorish dominion. Granada fell, and the last king, Abd-Allah, or, as he is commonly called, Boabdil,¹ with the remains of his shattered army, was fain to seek refuge in the country,² from whence his victorious ancestors had issued seven centuries before, and won from the ancestors of his conquerors a land in which, to this day, the traveller sees unmistakable traces of the once dominant race, not only in the architecture of the country, but in the manners, habits, dress, and countenances of the inhabitants of Southern Spain:³ in no European country is there such a large mixture of Semetic blood. With the conquest of Moorish Spain came the Inquisition, in order to reduce to the Catholic faith every inhabitant of that country; the well-known names of the great statesman Cardinal Jimenes, and the equally famous, or perhaps infamous, inquisitor, Torquemada, now appear on every page of the histories of those times; no period that went before

¹ The tomb of Boabdil has been lately identified at Tlemcen.

² It is a curious fact that the Spanish Moors were far from being welcomed back by their African brethren, they were rather looked upon as an alien race; perhaps this fact, as well as their desire to revenge themselves on the Spaniard, induced them to take up piracy as a profession, which the advent of the two Barbarossa elaborated into a permanent institution.

³ Pure Gothic blood, so much prized by the Spanish hidalgo, hardly exists except in the mountains of the Asturias and of Navarre. The Christians living under Arab rule adopted the language and habits of their conquerors, so that they seem almost to have lost Spanish nationality, as well as Christianity; intermarriages were so frequent, that their children were popularly known as Mozarabians (young Arabs): besides this, in the compulsory conversion of the Jews, the youth of the latter, of both sexes, were received into the most noble families, who acted as god-parents, and were permitted to intermarry with other noble families, as if they had been real, and not adopted, children only. A story is told of the Marquis of Pombal, who, when king Joseph I. of Portugal issued a command that all Jews, and those who had Jewish blood in their veins, should wear a yellow hat, appeared in court with three hats of that colour; on being demanded of the king for whom these hats were intended, he replied, that one was for himself, another for the king, the other for the grand inquisitor, all of whom had Jewish blood in their veins.

equalled the persecutions that the Jews suffered under the unrelenting Inquisition. Llorente, in his *History of the Inquisition*, tells us that while Torquemada held chief office ten thousand two hundred and seventy Jews were burnt; six thousand eight hundred burnt in effigy; and ninety-seven thousand three hundred and twenty-one marked with infamy. The ruin of the Jew was, at that time, the destruction of commerce; war had desolated the fair and rich provinces formerly held by the Moors, and had destroyed the system of irrigation introduced by the latter,—a system, which caused that bounteous land to yield a hundred fold to the diligent husbandman. Now every source of wealth was dried up, and Spain, even with her splendid reconquest, would have sunk far below the lowest of European kingdoms, had not the discoveries of Christovallo Colonna opened out the boundless wealth of the new world to that exhausted country. There can be no doubt that one great cause of the Jewish persecution was to recruit the royal coffers with gold; to make the descendants of the crucifiers of the Son of God pay for the crusades of the Catholic Spaniard against the infidel was only in the eyes of the men of those days but an act of simple justice; so far was this general extortion carried, that we find the Inquisition sparing neither converts, nor unbelieving Jews; all who were possessed of wealth were accused of the crime of Judaising, and sentenced to death or infamy; so barefaced was this system, that we actually have a Brief of Pope Sixtus IV. dated January, 1481, despatched to Ferdinand and Isabella, complaining of the acts of two Inquisitors, Morillo and San Martin, for persecuting persons who were real Catholics, declaring them to be heretics, and condemning them to death, in order to get possession of their property. The Brief ends with saying that these two inquisitors deserve punishment and forfeiture of their office. The Brief was without effect; for we read afterwards that the exigencies of the state proved stronger than zeal for the Catholic faith, for thousands of baptized Jews were permitted to Judaize in secret on payment of a large sum of money in lieu of Christianity. But the living did not prove sufficient to satisfy the king's demands, or the necessities of the State; legal proceedings were instituted against converted Jews who were then dead, and had been rich. These were solemnly arraigned before the Inquisition, where they were, of course, found guilty of Judaising; upon which their property, or rather that of their heirs, was confiscated, and deposited in the royal treasury, while their bodies were disinterred and committed to the flames. Yet even all these efforts, which we should think would have entirely rooted out Judaism from Spain, really failed

to do so. The people of Israel clung to Spanish soil with an unequalled obstinacy; rather than quit it they dissembled, they pretended to adopt Christianity, and, under that pretence, they rose to high offices in Church and State: we find secret Jews who held Government offices, even bishoprics, and other ecclesiastical posts; nay, we find some in the ranks of the Inquisition itself.

These troublous times did not quench the love of literature among the learned. Holland afforded a safe asylum from persecution, and a home for learning; from thence it spread through Germany, where it revenged itself on the Christian persecutions it suffered in Spain by imbuing the Christian intellect with infidel philosophy. Baruch Spinoza, the father of modern Pantheism, was the son of a family of expelled Spanish Jews; and most of the rationalistic writers are countrymen of his, as well as followers of his philosophy.¹ R. Solomon Ben Virga, in his '*Sceptre of Judah*,' has written an interesting history of the fortunes of his people since the destruction of the second temple. Religious, astronomical, and medical works, still continued to appear as in the Golden Age of Jewish prosperity; nor was the spirit of poetry, or of fiction, dead. R. Berachiah published a collection of fables taken from those of Æsop and Phædrus, many of which he remodeled, adding others drawn from the Talmud. It is from him that La Fontaine compiled his collection.

Spanish literature is largely indebted to the Talmud and to Jewish writers, for much that we give the Spaniard credit for; many, perhaps the greater number of, proverbs which filled the mouth of Sancho Panza and the Spaniard of the present day, derive their origin from this source. The celebrated cases brought before the famous Governor of the Island of Barataria, together with that sapient person's decisions, are all extracted from the Talmud.

We do not intend to harrow the feelings of our readers with details of the proceedings of the Inquisition; it is enough to say that all the old stories of Jews crucifying children, murdering them to obtain their blood for their Passover feasts, of their stealing the consecrated host, and stabbing it with knives till it bled, of magic and witchcraft, were all revived in their most savage form: strange, we hear nothing of any of these charges while the Jews were at liberty, and could have perpetrated such deeds almost with impunity—it is sufficient to say that every possible indignity and persecution, which religious hatred and human covetousness could devise, was tried upon them, till at length

¹ See some remarks on this in an article in Dr. Wolff, *Christian Remembrances*, vol. xlii. A good sketch of the life of Spinoza is given in '*A Biographical History of Philosophy*,' by G. H. Lewes, vol. iii. Knight's Series.

residence in Spain became impossible. A decree was issued ordering them to turn Christians or to leave the country; in case of disobedience, death was to follow. Such brief space of time was allowed, that they had no opportunity even to dispose of their immovable property. Purchasers took such advantage of this decree, that the unfortunate Israelites were obliged to conclude the most ruinous bargains, so that, according to Bernaldez, 'they would barter a house for an ass, and a vineyard for a garment.' Portugal still offered something like an asylum, for these fearful decrees were not yet issued there; accordingly, we read from the same authority, that, in 1492, one hundred and sixty thousand families voluntary exiled themselves,¹ of whom one hundred and eighty-three found refuge in Portugal: from whence, however, they were afterwards exiled. Some of the expelled went to France and Flanders; but the majority emigrated to Constantinople, and other places in the Turkish Empire, and to Algier and Morocco, where, to this day, they speak among themselves the Spanish tongue.² Terrible were the sufferings of those exiles; some embarked in Moorish vessels, where these pirates plundered them of their goods, then landed them naked and without food on some barren place on the coast of North Africa; stress of weather drove some back to Spanish ports, where, unable any longer to endure their sufferings, they applied for Christian baptism, that they might remain in their beloved land. After six months' sojourn in Portugal, the king, imitating the conduct of Ferdinand, and commencing to practise extortions, the miserable remnant of Israel embarked for Morocco, and formed a sort of camp at Arcilla, with the intention to proceed to Fez. Hearing of the plundering propensities of the Moors, they asked leave to return to Spain, where they purchased rest at the expense of their religion.³

¹ Zurita says four hundred thousand, and Mariana eight hundred thousand, persons.

² Those who have visited the bazaars in Constantinople will remember the number of boys who are ever ready to act as interpreters in making bargains with Turkish merchants; nearly all of these are descendants of Spanish Jews. It is perhaps also a remnant of Spanish nationality, that in Algier Jewish shops are shut on Sunday morning, as well as their own sabbath; indeed, the unbelieving Jew observes the Sunday better than the Christian Frenchman.

³ Deut. xxviii. 64, &c. will occur to the recollection of most of our readers; it is impossible for any description to express more clearly than this prophecy, delivered nearly three thousand years before, the miserable condition of dispersed Israel: 'And the Lord shall scatter thee among all people, from the one end of the earth even unto the other . . . and among these nations thou shalt find no ease, neither shall the sole of thy foot have rest; but the Lord shall give thee there a trembling heart, and failing of eyes, and sorrow of mind: and thy life shall hang in doubt before thee, and thou shalt fear day and night, and shalt have none assurance of thy life: in the morning thou shalt say, Would God it were even! and at even thou shalt say, Would God it were morning! for the fear of thine heart wherewith thou shalt fear, and for the sight of thine eyes which thou shalt see.'

We are, perhaps, at first surprised to find the Moors, who had so long protected the Jews, now turned persecutors. They had been so for some time; persecution commenced before the breaking up of the kingdom of Granada, partly from the imprudence of the Jews themselves—some of the more zealous attempting to make converts of the Moors;—and partly from the advent of the Almohad—a fanatical sect, very numerous in Morocco,—who had been invited over to Spain to support the tottering power of the Khalifs. This sect, for some cause or other, was hostile to the Jews, and persecuted them both in Granada, and afterwards when they took refuge in Morocco. When the Turks took possession of Algier, the sufferings of the Jew recommenced; the barbarian Dey would appease his clamorous soldiers, and wipe off the arrears of pay, by granting them permission to plunder the Jews in the bazaars and shops. Perhaps the Jew is the only person in Algeria who is really benefited by the taking of that country by the French; he now stands on an equality with his former oppressor, though still subject to occasional outbursts of fanaticism.¹

Spain has paid dearly for its cruelty toward these children of her soil. For a short time she stood at the top of European greatness; her colonies, seizing upon the virgin wealth of the New World, poured into their mother's lap riches hitherto undreamt of; but the same selfish policy which expelled the Jews in order to appropriate their wealth, has alienated from her those once flourishing colonies, and stript her bare. The Church, too, which shared in, and generally incited, the State persecutions, has had her judgment also, as every traveller in Spain well knows, who has seen the number of ruined monasteries and convents throughout the whole country: the Church which helped the king to plunder the Jews has itself been plundered of its landed property to meet the exigencies of government; its ministers are but stipendiaries of the State. The Inquisition, that mighty engine to produce uniformity to the Catholic faith, by compelling all Jews and Moors to become Christians, became itself an insupportable burden, which was at last cast off. It has, however, left its indelible mark on the cramped and narrow mind of the Spaniard of to-day. With a country of boundless fertility, with mines of inexhaustible wealth, with every facility for commerce, the spirit of enterprise is wholly wanting, a dead

¹ On a Sunday morning, in April, 1859, as the English residents were proceeding to church, they found the street crowded with French and Arabs in a state of great excitement; on asking the cause, we received for answer, 'Une chasse des Juifs.' It afterwards was ascertained that the barbarian Turcos, who were then embarking for the Italian war, having some old grudge against the Jews, proceeded to wreak their hatred upon every Jew they saw; three were killed that morning.

level of mediocrity everywhere prevails; and a country, which is intended by nature, and by its position, to stand first among European kingdoms, has degraded itself below many which have not half its advantages.

Though we do not agree with Mr. Buckle in his narrow philosophy, his anti-Christian prejudices, and his intolerable self-sufficiency, yet we cannot deny that there is a great deal of truth in his account of Spanish civilization, both in its present character and in its more remote causes. The whole history of that country is a saddening picture of the evil effects of perverting religion, and its exponent, the Church, to be an engine for temporal purposes, and to procure its great intentions, not by convincing and enlightening the mind, but by compelling and controlling the body.

- ART. VIII.—1. GAMS: *Geschichte der Kirche im 19 Jahrhundert*. Tom. I. II. Vienna. 1859.
2. *Universalgeschichte der Christlichen Kirche. Lehrbuch für akademische Vorlesungen*. Von Dr. JOHANNES ALZOG, ordentl. Prof. der Theologie an die Universität Freiburg in Breisgau. Siebente Auflage. Mainz: Florian Kupferberg. 1860.
3. *Zustände der Kathol. Kirche in Schlesien*. Von M. A. THEINER. Regensburg. 1852.
4. *Kirchengeschichte der Schweiz unter der Römer-, Burgunder-, und Alemannenherrschaft*. Von Dr. E. F. GELPKE. Bern: J. Dalp. 1856.
5. Письма объ исторіи Сербовъ и Болгаръ. Соч. А. Гильердинга. Москва, 1855.
6. *Guia del estado eclesiastico para el año de 1848*. Por D. PRIMITIVO FUENTES. Madrid. 1848.
7. *Heylige en Roemweerdige Persoonen &c. in geheel Nederland, &c.* Door C. SMET, PRIESTER. Gent. 1846. 4 voll.
8. *Das ordens religiosas em Portugal*. Por PEDRO DINIZ. Lisboa. 1853.
9. *Historia Ecclesiastica Islandiæ, ab anno 1740 ad annum 1840*. Auctore P. Pétursson, Toparchiæ Snaefellnesensis et Hnappadalensis præposito. Havnæ. 1841. 4°.
10. *Den Danske Kirkes Historie efter Reformationen*. Ved LUDWIG HELWEG. Kjöbenhavn. 1851.
11. RIANCEY: *La Liberté de l'Eglise et la Persécution religieuse dans le Grand Duché de Bade*. Paris. 1853.
12. LANG: *Die oberrheinische Kirchenprovinz*. Tübingen. 1835.
13. *Kirche und Staat nach Ablauf der Kölner Irrung*. Von J. von GORRES. Weissenburg. 1842.
14. STOEVEKEN: *Clemens August [von Droste] in seinem Leben, Wirken und Tode*. Mainz. 1846.
15. *Concordat in Bayern*. Augsburg. 1847.
16. *Doctrine de Saint Simon*. Paris. 1826.
17. ARTAUD: *Histoire de Léon XII*. Paris. 1843.
18. *Paroles d'un Croyant*. Paris. 1833.
19. BATAIN: *Réponse d'un Chrétien aux Paroles d'un Croyant*. Paris. 1834.
20. BULAU: *Geschichte Deutschlands von 1806 bis 1830*. Hamburg. 1842.
21. *Polska w Kstalcie Dykcyonarza historyczno-statystyczno-jeograficznego*. Opisana przez Jędrzeja Słowaczynskiego. Parije. 1833—1838.

CONTEMPORARY Ecclesiastical History—where shall we look for it? Inquire for any annals of the English Church from the rise of Wesleyanism to the present time—the work does not exist.¹ In France, the Abbé Guettée's history only comes down to 1801. In Spain and Portugal the series of newspapers would alone form the ecclesiastical annals of the last seventy years. Austria's Church history finds a tolerably interesting writer in Gams; but that of the other German States must be picked out of concordats and gazettes, local histories and descriptions. Italy, as distinct from the papacy, is quite silent. Prussia—as our list shows—is rather more fortunate. Of the Universal Church, during that most eventful period since the Congress of Vienna, there is no detailed history; the best *résumé* is undoubtedly contained in the last 150 pages of Dr. Alzog's book, which stands second on our list.

Whoever is to be the Baronius of the present century will have difficulties to contend with of which that great father of Church history, of which Pagi, of which Cabassutius, of which Fleury, of which Natalis Alexander, knew nothing. The enormous mass of works which he must procure and study, which however formidable a hindrance, is nothing to that which arises from the disuse of Latin as the European language for Church history. Even granting that a scholar, devoted to the task, might master, in a few years, all the Romance languages of Europe sufficiently to serve his purpose, and, in a few more, under the same limits, the Teutonic tongues; then comes the more terrible difficulty of Slavonic, culminating from its easiest family, the old Church language, to its hardest, that most fearful study of Polish. And after that, Magyar lies behind him. And all this for the modern Church history of Europe alone.

We propose, in the following paper, to give a brief sketch of the Church history of Europe from the Congress of Vienna to the present time. We must bespeak the reader's kind consideration, and will previously apologise for the mistakes into which we are almost certain we shall fall. All we can pledge ourselves to do, is that we will not spare our labour. It is curious to think how very little is known of events which have happened in our own days, of personages who have lived within the last twenty years, when compared with similar events and people in the early and mediæval Church. How many, for instance, who are intimately acquainted with the life of Athanasius, of our own Thomas of Canterbury, of Gregory VII., never heard the name

¹ We may, however, hope that in a very short time the already commenced History of the English Church by Mr. Perry will satisfactorily fill this gap. It is a work which we shall probably have occasion to review.

of the ever-memorable Clement August von der Droste? Ask for the teaching of Nestorianism, and you shall get a fluent answer; put a question about S. Simonianism—and a blank silence. A man shall tell you what was condemned at Constance in 1415, who is perfectly ignorant what great doctor narrowly escaped censure at Bordeaux in 1853. And such names as those of Frayssinons, Balmez, Sailer, Hinterberger, Brentano, Klee, Gitzler, Powondra, Reinhe, and the like, how unknown are they to most English ears!

We commence at the period when the fountains of the great deep, broken up by the First Revolution, seemed to have subsided. It is marvellous to think that, from the very first to the very last, that tempestuous period only lasted twenty-six years; in other words, that our Queen's present length of reign is not so far short of measuring it. And what portentous changes it had brought on the Church! Monasticism swept out of France, a third part of her bishoprics suppressed, the union of the secular and ecclesiastical rule, in such sees as Salzburg, Cologne, Mayence, Liége, at an end for ever; the Holy Roman Empire, that secular correlative of the Papacy, shattered in pieces; the Church treasures of Spain and Portugal utterly gone; religious houses in Belgium escaping but by the skin of their teeth; Austria and Bavaria secularising nearly half their convents; in fact, Naples and Sicily the only lands that retained unaltered the old *régime*. The temporal power of the Papacy seemed trembling in the scale; another large Protestant kingdom had arisen, partly on the ruins of Austria. The times seemed very dark for the Latin Church when the Congress of Vienna met.

Gregory Barnabas Chiaromonte, Cardinal Bishop of Imola, was then in the sixteenth year of his pontificate as Pius VII. Considering the composition of the Congress at Vienna, that no man of eminent talent espoused the interests of the Church, that Dalberg, Primate of Germany, would not interfere, the general decision of the assembled statesmen was remarkably favourable to the Holy See, especially in the precedence which they accorded to its legates. True, Consalvi, Vicar-General of Constance, Papal Nuncio at Vienna, felt himself bound to issue a protest against certain acts which trench on Roman prerogative; but, on the whole, the calm holy old man who then steered S. Peter's bark must have felt that he had achieved a victory. On the dissolution of the Congress, the altered territorial disposition of Germany first claimed the attention of Rome. The new kingdom of Wurtemberg had aggregated to itself parts of the once independent bishoprics of Constance, Wurzburg, Worms, Spires; Baden, too, Nassau, and Electoral Hesse had so changed their hands as to necessitate an altered

ecclesiastical régime. Accordingly, by the bull *Provida solersque sollicitudo* (Aug. 16, 1821), Freiburg in Breisgau (not many years before given up by Austria) was constituted the archbishopric for the Grand Duchy of Baden; with the suffragan sees of Rottenburg for Wurtemberg (the Lutheran ecclesiastics evincing a great objection to the creation of a bishopric in Stuttgart), Limburg for Nassau, Mainz for Hesse Darmstadt, and Fulda for Electoral Hesse. The bull *De salute animarum* (July 16, 1821) settled the ecclesiastical affairs of Prussia; and, in 1824, a concordat for Hanover re-established the two sees of Osnabrück and Hildesheim. The reintroduction of the Jesuits into some of the Italian States, the reform and aggrandisement of the Propaganda, principally carried on by Cardinal Pedicini, and a perpetual struggle with the Carbonari, occupied the Pope's last years. A concordat with Victor Emmanuel, of Sardinia, gave that kingdom nineteen bishoprics under the archiepiscopal Sees of Turin, Vercelli, and Genoa. Another, with Ferdinand, of Naples, united some few small sees in Calabria, increasing their number in Sicily. Dignities in abbeys, and collegiate and cathedral churches, were reserved in the first six months to the Pope, in the last to the bishop. Church property remained with an *uti possedetis*. Full of years and honour, Pius VII. departed this life August 21, 1823, having lived eighty-two years, and held the Pontificate twenty-three; a year shorter than his predecessor, longer than any other pontiff but one. Those who sat more than twenty-one years are only

	Years.	Months.	Days.
Pius VI.	24	6	14
Hadrian I.	23	10	17
Pius VII.	23	5	6
Alexander III.	21	11	23
S. Silvester I.	21	0	4

It is well known that an ancient tradition forbids the hope to any of S. Peter's successors *pervenire ad annos Petri: i.e.* to reign twenty-five years.

While we are on this subject, we may mention the very singular rule, or rather coincidence, which has been imagined to determine, in the earlier half of a century, the length of the reigning pontiff's life. Add his number to the number of his predecessor, and that to ten, and the result is the fatal year. Pius VII. succeeded Pius VI.—six and seven are thirteen; add ten, which makes twenty-three; Pius VII. died in 1823. Leo XII. succeeded Pius VII.—twelve and seven are nineteen; add ten, and you have twenty-nine; Leo XII. died in 1829. Pius VIII. succeeded Leo XII.—eight and twelve are twenty; add ten, thirty; Pius VIII. died in 1830.

Pius VII. was succeeded by the Cardinal Hannibal de la Genga, who took the name of Leo XII. The holiness of this pontiff's life was never denied; but his strong political views, concurring as they did with the height of the reactionism against the French Revolution, left, no doubt, an influence on the Holy See, which, in after days, brought forth sad trouble. He became an especial mark for Protestant indignation, on account of the bull '*Ut primum ad summi*,' in which he especially condemned Bible Societies. His chief work was the reorganization of the Bishoprics of Brazil—in connexion with the separation of that vast empire from Portugal. He died Feb. 10, 1829.

After an interregnum of forty-nine days, Cardinal Castiglioni succeeded as Pius VIII. Times were now changing. Reform was advancing with hasty steps in England—the Legitimist dynasty was almost at an end in France. The new pontiff had but little time allowed to show how completely he trod in the footsteps of his predecessor. He nobly exerted himself in the cause of the poor slaves in Brazil—put forth the whole power of Rome in the matter of mixed marriages in the Rheno-Prussian provinces;—entertained a closer correspondence with the 'Uniat' Armenians; and considered freemasonry of so deistical a tendency as to direct a bull against it. It was at the commencement of his pontificate that that most righteous act of 'Catholic Emancipation' was carried in England. The July revolution broke out—Charles X. became an exile;—and the difficulties and dangers of the time are imagined, by his biographer, to have shortened the good but rather narrow-minded pontiff's life. He went, as we may piously believe, to a better world, on S. Andrew's Day, 1830.

The conclave which followed—in its fifty days' length—fixed the eye of Europe on its deliberations, on account of the gloomy state of both the political and ecclesiastical atmosphere;—till at length, on Candlemas Day, 1831, the words, *Evangelizo vobis gaudium magnum—habemus Papam*, were heard from that eagerly watched window; and Cardinal Mauro Capellari was chosen, and took the name of Gregory XVI. The commencement of his Pontificate was marked by the rebellion of Bologna, and the uneasy feeling of sympathy which manifested itself in Rome itself—both crushed out, for that time, by the Austrian soldiery. The glory of his reign, however, consisted in the unusual number of brilliant scholars who then flourished at Rome. In dogmatic theology, Perrone and Delsignore; in Scripture exegesis, Patrius; in philosophy, Ventura, Orsi, Bonelli. Angelo Mai, the learned librarian of the Vatican, and that marvel of languages, Mezzofanti, were both advanced by Gregory to a place in the

Sacred College. The great blow which under this Pope the Roman Church received in the re-amalgamation with the Eastern Church of the Uniates of White Russia, has been too often referred to in these pages to need more than one sentence here; while the troubles connected with Lamennais, and the struggle between Cologne and Berlin, will better be told in another place. Gregory XVI. departed this life, June 1, 1846. As dark times seemed at hand, an instant choice was necessary. The conclave only sat three days, and on June 16 Cardinal Mastai Ferretti, Bishop of Imola, then only fifty-four years of age, became Pius IX.

The early alliance of this pontiff with liberal notions—its unsatisfactory result—the revolution at Rome—his flight to Gaeta—the French intervention—all these matters are fresh in the remembrance of our readers. Pius IX.'s ecclesiastical actions have certainly afforded matter for history. His encyclic to the Oriental Christians (Jan. 6, 1848), which we noticed at the time, raised a perfect storm of indignation in the East. Not unnatural, indeed, was the feeling; it is only to be regretted that the temper of the document was not equal to the soundness of its reasoning. The most celebrated and by far the saddest event of his pontificate was the proclamation of the Immaculate Conception as a dogma of the faith (Dec. 8, 1854), a day hereafter to be remembered with bitter tears by the Latin Church; and his confirmation of that declaration in the bull *Ineffabilis*—thenceforward a wider gulf than ever between us and Rome—while the great schism of East and West is fearfully exasperated, and grievous injury done to those great saints like Bernard, who strongly opposed as even a permissive belief what is now asserted as a certainty. The bulls of Sept. 24, 1850, and March 7, 1853, which constituted a Roman hierarchy respectively in England and in Holland, must not be forgotten. Happier works were, the Concordat with Spain (March 16, 1851), with Austria (Aug. 18, 1855), Wurtemberg (April 8, 1857), and Costa Rica (June 9, 1858). The principal Cardinals raised by him to the scarlet hat are, Von Geissel, Archbishop of Cologne; Von Seitoßski, Archbishop of Gran; Wiseman, so-called of Westminster; and Von Rauscher, of Vienna. The saints he has canonised are, of Jesuits—John de Britto and Peter Claver; John Grande, of the Order of S. John of God; and Paul of the Cross, who founded the order of that name; also Maria Anna de Paredes.

It is worth while, before we turn from the See of Rome, to look at the characters given to the Popes whose reigns we have been considering, in the famous prophecy of S. Malachi; because, whether his or not, we cannot but believe it to be more

than a coincidence that the prediction and fact should so tally. It was first printed in 1595, by Arnold Wyon, in his '*Lignum Vitæ*;' but the reader may most easily see it in Moreri's Dictionary, or M. Henrion's '*Histoire des Papes*' (Paris, 1832).

Pius VII. *Aquila rapax.*

Is not this a wonderful motto, when we remember how the French eagle swooped on the aged Pontiff, and ravened him out of his possessions?

Leo XII. *Canis et Coluber.*

Pius VIII. *Vir religiosus.*

Gregory XVI. *De Balneis Etruriæ.*

He was of the order of the Camaldulites; and the baths of Camaldole in Tuscany, their mother-house, are famous.

Pius IX. *Cruz de Cruce.*

The arms of Sardinia are a cross argent; a heavy cross indeed to the reigning pontiff. (We believe that this is the first time this explanation has been given—the prophecy not having been re-published since the crowning aggression of Sardinia.)

The remaining eleven Pontiffs—for according to this prophecy, there will be only eleven more—are thus characterised:

1. *Lumen in celo.*

2. *Ignis ardens.*

3. *Religio depopulata.*

4. *Fides intrepida.*

5. *Pastor angelicus.*

11. In persecutione extremâ sacræ Romanæ Ecclesiæ sedebit PETRUS

Romanus, qui pascet oves in multis tribulationibus: quibus transactis, civitas septicollis diruetur, et Judex tremendus judicabit populum.

6. *Pastor et nauta.*

7. *Flos florum.*

8. *De medietate lunæ.*

9. *De labore solis.*

10. *Gloria olivæ.*

In connexion with this last prediction, we may remark that Imperial Rome began and ended in Augustus—the ten tribes in Oshea or Hoshea.

We will next give a glance at the history of the Church in each principal European nation; and will commence with France.

On the accession of Louis XVIII. the Catholic faith was in the constitutional charter established as the national religion, with toleration for Lutherans and Calvinists; but not—so far as regards public teaching—for any sectarian who declined to class himself in one or the other of the two recognised heresies. The King himself was a man of real piety: but his encouragement of and attendance on religious processions in a city which, only twenty-one years before, had raised on its Cathedral high altar, and there worshipped, a naked prostitute, was doubtless in the highest degree injudicious. Taking the hint from our own

Christian Knowledge Society, 'The Catholic Association for the Dispersion of the Christian Books' was formed under the presidency of the Duke de Montmorency, and soon obtained considerable success. A new concordat with Rome was arranged under the management of Count Blacas and De Persigny, (July 11, 1817), superseding that of Leo X. with Francis I. and the organic Articles of 1801. By the latter arrangement, the French sees had been fixed at the number of sixty; ten archbishoprics, fifty bishoprics. But one whole metropolitical province, Mechlin, with its seven bishops, had since been lost to France; so had the See of Nice, in the province of Aix. The suppressed *régime* had contained 23 archbishops and 133 bishops. The new concordat proposed to strike a mean between the two; and immediately met with great opposition in the Chambers, and could not be carried out till 1822; the number was then fixed at sixty-six bishoprics and fourteen archbishoprics. The French traveller will observe the evil consequences arising from the suppression or union of so many sees. Laon was joined to Soissons; the old diocese of Laon is one of the most dead in France. Beauvais and Noyon were added to Senlis; Noyon at least (for of Beauvais the writer knows less) is very sluggish. So with regard to Toul, which went to the comparatively modern see of Nancy. We give instances with which we are familiarly acquainted.

Another difficulty had to be contended against; the depressed and impoverished condition of the Church rendered it hard to find labourers for her vineyard. The younger sons of the nobility who could have been commendatory abbés, or deans, or who might have accumulated a few prebendal stalls in various collegiate churches, would now scorn to accept a bishopric. It was actually hailed as a symptom of reviving religion in 1823, that two hundred priests in that year had been ordained more than had died. The King exerted himself to remedy the financial difficulties of the Church; and, in a short time, her revenues were increased by the yearly increase of nearly 4,000,000 francs. What was that, however, compared to her enormous wealth previous to '89? And, in good truth, however laudable in Louis XVIII. was the effort, this outward mine of wealth could do nothing without the inward advances of earnestness. Nor were tokens of the latter wanting. Even then the influx of German and Flemish workmen had begun, which has since, in Alsace, raised Colmar and Thann, and Soultz and Uebweller, to be what they are. In like manner, Flanders has made Lille and Roubaix rivals of our own manufacturing towns. The Brothers of Christian Doctrine, the spiritual offspring of the venerable De la Salle, then first began to assume

their present importance; and the Ursulines were honourably distinguished above the other orders for their zeal in education, for the propagation of the faith prospered greatly. Nor was the Church deficient in writers; Frayssinous, Bishop of Hermopolis *in partibus*—he died in 1841; De Maistre (1821); and Cardinal Bonald (1840), are, with whatever drawbacks in the case of the second, names that deserve to live in honour.

The accession of Charles X. (Sept. 19, 1824) was followed by intenser strife between the Royalist and Liberal parties. The King himself, like his brother, was a man of strong religious feelings. The attempt to carry a law of sacrilege (1825) through the Chambers, followed by the address of sixty archbishops and bishops, gave rise to a reaction. Very unwillingly, the monarch was compelled to suppress the Jesuits' schools, by an ordinance of July 16, 1828:—the bishops protested in no measured language; Leo XII. assumed the part of apologist for the King. Two short years, and the Three Days made Charles X. an exile for life; and the Gallican Church entered, under Louis Philippe, the Valley of the Shadow of Death.

The new charter no longer recognised the Catholic as the religion of the State; only as that of the majority of the French people. The Papacy had learnt wisdom from experience, and, in reply to a formal question of the Archbishop of Paris, ordered the clergy to acquiesce in, and to pray for, the new dynasty. Everywhere, however, the masses seemed to be separating from the Church; and, in consequence of an imprudent service performed in S. Germain l'Auxerrois for the soul of the Duke of Berri, on the anniversary of his murder, the mob not only gutted the church, but also the Archbishop's palace.

It was under these circumstances that Lamennais, Gerbet, Lacordaire, the Count de Montalembert, and others, united in a journal called *L'Avenir*: its motto, 'God and freedom,' showed its aim. The Church was not an arbitrary, not a Legitimist body: the Church, the champion of freedom in the middle ages, ought to be and should be so now. Intellectual freedom was her doctrine, and so forth;—and by degrees this kind of teaching degenerated here and there into a near approach to free-thinking. Still, the attempt was well meant; and, though some check was necessary, one cannot but feel that the authors were harshly treated. There was somewhat really dangerous, no doubt, in the work: somewhat also that only appeared dangerous to the narrow-minded advisers of the Court of Rome. *L'Avenir* was condemned by an encyclic of Gregory XVI. August 15, 1832, and immediately ceased to appear. The other writers submitted themselves unreservedly to the censure; Lamennais only grew hardened, and presently produced the '*Paroles d'un Croyant*,'

and the still more frightful 'Livre du Peuple,' the 'Essays and Reviews' of that day. He had now thrown off the profession of the Catholic faith; and the ablest pens on the side of the Church were put into requisition against him. None wrote better or more touchingly than his former friend Gerbet:¹—

'On sent tout ce que ces paroles me coutent. Celui qui déclare une guerre ouverte à l'Eglise, qui prophétise sa ruine, qui, dans les dernières pages de l'écrit qu'il vient de publier, n'a pas craint d'outrager, par le plus brutal sarcasme, l'auguste vieillard que la Chrétienté salue du nom de Père, a eu en moi un ancien ami, qui l'aimait d'une amitié née au pied des autels, et qui avait pour lui autant de dévotion, je crois, qu'aucun de ces amis nouveaux qui sont venus courtoiser sa révolte. A ce souvenir je tombe aux genoux, offrant pour lui à Dieu des prières, dans lesquelles il n'a plus foi: et je ne me relève que pour combattre dans l'ami de ma jeunesse l'ennemi de tout ce que j'aime d'un éternel amour.'

Thus fell one of the ablest of French ecclesiastics, Lamennais. May GOD have had mercy on his soul!

During the whole of Louis Philippe's troubled reign the Church seemed to be losing ground. No fashionable man, in the capital, but would have been ashamed to confess to the world that he was a regular attendant at mass. Readers of the French journals of that time must remember how, in the Chambers, if reference were wished to be made to any fact which could only be patent to a worshipper in the church, the stereotyped formula was,—'Happening to be in—such a church—the other day, *on occasion of a marriage*, I there saw,' &c.

And the opposition offered to this tide of irreligion was chiefly by the ultra-development of the worship of S. Mary,—or by that sickly, sensuous, sentimental devotion to the Heart of JESUS. At the same time, powerful pens were enlisted on the Catholic side; De Montalembert, whom, in spite of his wrong-headedness to the English Church, many writers in this Review are proud to reckon as a friend; Lacordaire, Rio:—and now, too, Rohrbacher began his learned, though confused and Ultramontane 'Histoire de l'Eglise.' The Abbé Migne's *Patrologia*—poor, hurried, and meagre as is the text—let no one ever trust to it—yet opened out a path which may hereafter be followed with great success. And later came the singular controversy, in which the Abbé Gaume took so great a share—that of the *Ver Rongeur*:—whether studies of the classical authors, usually so called, can be the fitting education of a Christian priest. The wisdom with which Rome mediated in the dispute is most remarkable.

Towards 1840, the Church began to recover her ground. The

¹ We quote, not from the original, which at this moment is not before us, but from Alzog.

very curious discussions instituted in the churches of Paris—where one priest took the part of the infidel, the other of the Catholic—both, within certain limits, doing their best, drew interested multitudes. The present writer is not afraid to express his opinion, that, horribly profane as our English habits would make them here, in the city where they had their birth they were right, and they did good. The increasing influence of the Church is seen in the ministerial circular of May 22, 1841, which gave the Sisters of Charity such increased facilities of doing good.

During the interval which separated the fall of Louis Philippe from the Presidentship of Louis Bonaparte, the future of the French Church, to human eyes, seemed very doubtful. The wretched imposture of La Salette, the more wretched, because so devoutly believed in by many and many a faithful soul, undoubtedly, on the whole, strengthened the Church's cause for a time. But was there ever such a success won without a reaction? The noble death of the Archbishop of Paris at the barricades, also, doubtless, was one living fact of the Church's influence.

The present Emperor, as we know, has found it politically convenient, on the whole, to 'patronize' the Church. *Non tali auxilio*. But in her own energy and hard work the French Church may, especially in particular provinces, take just pride. To our mind, Belgium is the most earnest of all Roman Catholic countries. But next to that, Brittany (speaking generally), the whole western coast of France, ancient Burgundy and Auvergne—then Normandy and Picardy—and then Dauphiné and Franche-Comté, are noble examples of real Christian work. Lorraine, Alsace, and great part of Champagne, seem to us about the deadest portion of the Church.

The remarkable efforts which Gallicanism has made during the last ten years deserve at least some notice. The *Observateur Catholique* is, we hope, known to many of our readers:—it ought at least to be. Still more remarkable is *L'Union*, avowedly written by members of different branches of the Church. The great literary work of this revival is the Abbé Guettée's 'Histoire de l'Eglise de France,' which will immortalise his name, while it has ruined his earthly prospects.

It was probably to override this nascent spirit of Gallicanism that the provincial Councils of 1853 were held. That of Bordeaux, held at La Rochelle, was by far the most remarkable. It was seriously proposed to condemn Bossuet, and the Gallican Articles of 1682: Guettée's history was condemned. As a specimen of the composition of all, let us give the names of the component Bishops of this:

Donnet, Cardinal Archbishop of Bordeaux.

Villecourt, Bishop of La Rochelle.

George, Bishop of Périgueux.

De Levezou de Vesins, Bishop of Agen.

Bailles, Bishop of Luçon.

Pie, Bishop of Poitiers.

Cousseau, Bishop of Angoulême.

Leherpeur, Bishop of S. Pierre and Fort-de-France (Martinique).

Despréz, Bishop of S. Denis de la Réunion (Isles de la R.).

Forcade, Bishop of Basse-Terre (Guadaloupe).

These three Colonial Bishops lead, by comparison with ourselves, to the consideration :—1. How utterly impossible it would be to conduct a colonial system like our own on such principles. 2. Have most of our prelates zeal enough to cross the Atlantic, or the Southern Ocean, to attend a provincial council?

We may now turn our attention to Spain.

Here, immediately after the return of Ferdinand VII. in 1814, we find the Church in the same unhappy league with Absolutism, and in the same opposition to so-called Liberalism, as in other European States. Ferdinand's tottering throne was upheld by the French advance of 1823: but he gradually lost the confidence of the 'priest party,' to use the wretched modern slang—in plain English, of the national Church—and even in his lifetime a plot was carried on for raising his brother, Don Carlos, to the throne. On the death of his first wife, the King married his niece, Maria Christina, of Naples. And, be it observed, to the infamous dispensation which permitted him so to do, the Church of Spain owes her bitterest enemies. Ferdinand, finding his health declining, and the hope of a son at an end, abolished the then Salic Law of Spain, declared his daughter heir, in exclusion of his brother, and died on Michaelmas Day, 1833. The Basque Provinces and Arragon broke out into rebellion against Isabella II., a child of three years old. The clergy generally favoured Don Carlos. It was our own struggle of 1715 and 1745 over again; only fought out with the semi-Arabian blood of Spaniards. The cholera attacked Madrid (1834). The monks—ultra-monarchical beyond the secular clergy—were declared to have poisoned the wells. The most horrible calumnies were propagated against them: but, alas! there was also much horrible truth—not so much against the monasteries as against the cathedral and collegiate churches. It is wretched to speak of such things. But, acquainted as the writer is with the Peninsula, it would be dishonest in him not to confess them. The Chapter of Seville had about seventy greater and fifty lesser dignitaries. Of the former, at the dissolution, scarcely one but had his acknowledged mistress—his

barragana—for the clergy had the disgrace of an especial word for such a connexion. What a state of things that must have been when the proverb was current—

‘En la calle de los Abades
Todos han Tíos, y ningunos Padres.’

Or this :—the ‘Commandments of the Canons :’—

‘El primero—
Es amar a Don Dinero ;
El segundo—
Es amolar a todo el mundo ;
El tercero—
Buen vaca y carnero ;
El cuarto—
Ajunar despues de harto ;
El quinto—
Buen blanco y tinto :
Y estos cinco se encierran en dos,
Todo para mi, y nada para vos.’

‘The first—Sir Money to love with zeal ;
The second—to grind the world to meal ;
The third—of mutton and beef good store ;
The fourth—*he* may fast who can eat no more ;
The fifth—good wine both white and red :
—And yet one thing remains to be said ;
The whole of the five may be summ’d in two,
—All for me, and nothing for you !’

Nevertheless, though these horrid scandals no doubt prevailed in some of the larger monasteries and collegiate establishments, the countless country foundations were the positive blessings of the land. Centres of religious teaching, charity, civilization—excellent landlords, skilful agriculturists—they formed the material for the enormous mass of Spanish ecclesiastical memoirs, and by subscribing to them they rendered publication possible. No sooner did a Church history come out, than some 1,100 or 1,200 copies were taken by the monastic libraries. Hence such glorious works as Florez’s ‘*España Sagrada* ;’ which though nominally continued since the dissolution, is so only by Government aid, is little read,—and comparatively, from the wholesale destruction of records, little worth reading.

The law of June 21, 1835, suppressed NINE HUNDRED monasteries. The rest fell under the Jewish apostate, Mendizabal, on the 11th of the following October. In 1837 the Cortes declared tithes and all other possessions of the Church national property. A small pension was allotted to each monk, but never, or seldom, paid. The present writer first visited Spain in June, 1848. It was the most touching thing to see these poor aged men, ghosts of their former selves, ashamed yet forced to beg, creeping about the chapels of that great cathedral

of Seville, or emerging from behind one of the enormous piers, and asking 'in the most sweet name of JESUS,' if it were but for a single *cuarto*. And all this sacrilege, did it enrich the land? Not by one farthing. The vast sums went, none knew where: no man made his fortune by them: the national exchequer was poorer than ever; land of course, having lost its best agriculturists, fell out of cultivation: and the cry of the poor went up to heaven. If any one wishes to see the *waste*, the brutal waste, of the suppression, let him go to Valladolid. There, in a hall of the museum, are some eighteen or twenty set of magnificent cinque-cento stalls, some inlaid with marqueterie, some after the Grinling Gibbons style of foliage, collected from the suppressed monasteries, and there brought together to no possible purpose; not studies of art, not valuable as examples, never used, and never to be used. There also are *colgaduras*, *trasparentes*, *sagrarios*, and *facistoles*, that once would have delighted the very heart of an ecclesiologist, but which now are buried in a saloon, where they are hurried over by the visitor, and then consigned to the silence and solitude of weeks. But to return to our subject. A plan of Church reform was brought forward in 1837, which involved the suppression of seventeen and the erection of five sees. Numbers of priests and several bishops joined Don Carlos. Rome refused bulls for their successors; see after see fell vacant; and serious thoughts were entertained of breaking off all connexion with the Papal authority, and declaring Spain an independent national Church. At length, when twenty-two bishoprics at home and in the colonies were widowed, Don Julian Villalba was sent as agent to Rome. The Church found, however, her defenders; and the journals called *The Catholic*, *The Prophet*, and *Religion* were not without their influence. Then came the Septembrist battle of 1840, which had for its aim the banishment of Christina. Insurrectionary juntas were formed all over the country: venerable pastors and bishops were everywhere driven away; and miserable priests, suspended for infamous lives, or overwhelmed with debt, had but to call themselves *liberal*, and to step into what place they might fancy. The majority of the assessors of the *Rota de la nunciatura Apostolica* were suspended by the Madrid Junta. The Papal Nuncio, Ramirez de Arellano, protested. The Government of Espartero instantly gave him his passport, and ordered the police to see him over the frontier. Gregory XVI. in an allocution of March 1, 1841, set forth the manifold wrongs which that Government had done to the Church of Spain. It was answered by a manifesto of Espartero. The mob was everywhere hounded on against the priests—the Minister of Grace and Justice especially distinguished himself by the brutality

of his language, and the insolence of his acts. The Pope, as a last resource, demanded, in an energetic epistle, the prayers of all the faithful for the persecuted Church of Spain.

Then it was seen that, notwithstanding all the cross that had gathered round it, there was yet fine gold that went into this furnace of affliction. Many a heroic action was then performed by priests, that yet lives in the hearth-talk of a winter night amidst the wild glens of the Alpujarras, or the upland farms of Oviedo, or the dreary *paramos* of Castile. Bishops there were, too, who set their faces like a flint against the incoming of blasphemy and infidelity, under the title of Liberalism. All honour to such men as Rafael de Velez, Archbishop of Santiago; as Fernando de Echanove y Zaldivar, Bishop of Tarragona; as Simon de Guardiola, of Urgel; as Fort y Puig, of Barbastro; as Felix Herrero y Valverde, of Orihuela; and as Domingo de Silos Moreno, of Cadiz. Balmez, perhaps the greatest theologian of his time, exerted himself in keeping up the courage of the younger priests. 'Learn wisdom,' he cried, 'at the foot of the cross, and this century is yours! Feel the privilege of the light affliction,' which is but for a moment, and unborn Spaniards shall honour you as the LORD'S confessors! On you hang the golden hopes of this country. Give way, and she will sink lower and lower in the scale of nations: stand firm, and the present troubles are but her agony into a glorious future!' Another noble name, too, Donoso Cortes, shows that even then, in her lowest degradation, Spain possessed at least one Catholic and honourable statesman. Against him it was that the *Times* used to spit its bitterest venom.

With the assumption of the reins of government by Isabella II. affairs mended a little. Gradually Rome and the Court of Madrid drew together; and in one day, Aug. 16, 1847, the following sees were filled:—Toledo, Cordova, Cuença, Sigüenza, Jaen, Carthage, Osma, Avila, Granada, Santander, Gerona, Teruel, Majorca; thirteen in all. Almost as many were filled in the next month, and several in October. On March 16, 1851, the Concordat was signed, but the Church received another blow by the return of Espartero in 1854; and for a time the Nuncio Franchi left Madrid. Since then a miserable fraction of her property has been restored; but abbeys, convents, in a mass, and many a fair collegiate church are gone for ever.

It must be confessed that there is very little Church-life in Spain at the present moment; and no country, not even England, gives less outward appearance of being Catholic. The Church at present consists of the following provinces; the number of suffragans is affixed to each.

Patriarchate of the Indies, titular.

Toledo, 7.	Granada, 2.	Valencia, 4.
Valladolid, ¹ }	Burgos, 5.	Santiago de Cuba, 2.
Santiago, 12. }	Tarragona, 8.	Manila, 3.
Seville, 5.	Saragossa, 6.	

Besides which, there are the exempt bishoprics of Leon and Oviedo; the Abad-Mayor (always a bishop) of Alcala la Real; and the Prior-Bishops of Ucles and San Marcos de Leon. There certainly now needs some reform in territorial arrangements. There are so many exempt parishes, which once depended on some great abbey, but which of course have now no head; so many collegiate churches with episcopal jurisdiction, but which are now scarcely in existence. Some of these jurisdictions *vere nullius*, as the Spaniards call them, are hooked and dovetailed into the middle of a diocese in the strangest imaginable way. There are also arrangements of this nature. In the odd years certain parishes are under the diocesan; in the even years they are *vere nullius*;—others, in the odd months, belong to the former; in the even months to the latter. These singularities might have been harmless while the monastic system was flourishing: at present, in many instances, the parish priest is half his time under his bishop, and half his time without any superior.

Let us now look to Switzerland (and here we may mention, with especial approbation, Dr. Gelpke's History, at least so much of it as has already appeared). In earlier times that country was partly under the jurisdiction of Besançon, partly of Milan, partly of Constance, partly of Mainz: an arrangement than which it is not easy to conceive anything more inconvenient in itself;—besides its complication with the divided religions of the cantons. As every one knows, Freiburg, Solothurn, Luzerne, Zug, Unterwalden, Schwyz, Uri, Tessin, Wallis, are Catholic: Schaffhausen, Bale, Glarus, Zurich, Bern, Vaud, Neuchatel, are Protestant; the remainder being mixed. It was no wonder, therefore, that a general desire was felt for the establishment of a national bishopric. Pius VII. was very unwilling to concede the boon; and for some time, the bishopric of Constance being declared to have no longer any jurisdiction in Switzerland, the cantons were governed by Göldlin von Tiefenau, an ecclesiastic of great influence and piety, as Apostolic Vicar. The arrangement answered as long as he lived; but at his death, in 1819, the Prince-Bishop of Chur, Charles Rudolph von Buol-Schauenstein, who succeeded to the Vicariate Apostolic, could not command the same esteem. Aargau, especially, was anxious to be reannexed to Constance. A long series of

¹ Valladolid has only lately been raised to an Archbishopric, and the writer is not yet acquainted with the number of its suffragans.

alterations took place, which it would not interest the reader to particularize: they gave occasion to the bull *Inter multiplices* of Pius VII., and *Inter precipua nostri Apostolatus* of Leo XII. The present arrangement, which, having been partially adopted in 1841, was finally carried out by the Concordat of Nov. 7, 1845, is as follows:—The bishoprics are: 1. *Basle*, with jurisdiction over the cantons Luzerne, Zug, Solothurn, Aargau, Thurgau, Basle City, Basle Country, Zurich, and Bern north of the Aar—the see is at Solothurn. 2. *Geneva* and *Lausanne*, for Freiburg, Geneva, Vaud, Neuchatel, Bern south of the Aar—the see is at Freiburg. 3. *Sion*, for Wallis. 4. *Chur*, for the Grisons, Uri, and Unterwalden. 5. *S. Gall* (this bishopric was founded in the celebrated abbey of that name in 1823, but held with Chur till 1845), for Schwyz, S. Gall, Appenzell, Schaffhausen, Glarus. The Italian-speaking population of Tessin are partly under the Bishop of Como, partly under the Archbishop of Milan. To make the arrangement complete, there wants a national archbishop in the capital of the first Catholic canton, Luzerne. An Apostolic Nuncio, however, resides there, who performs the functions of a Metropolitan.

After the Revolution of 1830, the Liberal press became more and more bitter in its attacks against the Church. To oppose these, an able periodical, the *Schweizer Kirchenzeitung*, was set on foot in 1832. But a greater danger sprang up within the Church herself. A strongly Erastian party arose, who advocated her separation from the Roman See. A theologian of some eminence for learning, but no great reputation for piety, Fischer, was at the head: its organ was the *Allgemeine Kirchenzeitung für Deutschland und die Schweiz*. The cantons which sympathised in the movement met at Baden, in 1834, and drew up certain Conference Articles, in which they made the Church the mere slave of the State. These Articles were condemned by Gregory XVI. in an encyclic of 1836. This led to the refoundation of the celebrated Jesuit College at Freiburg, originally founded by Canisius. Great success attended the work; the semi-infidel schools at Solothurn and Luzerne were well nigh crushed, and a great influx of parents took place into Freiburg. The educational establishment at Montet, for girls, conducted by Sisters of the Heart of Jesus, obtained also great influence.

At the commencement of 1841 the Council of Aargau, in formal contravention of a ground law of the Swiss Confederation, dissolved all the monasteries in that State, the revenues of which amounted to more than 30,000*l*. It was in vain that the Nuncio, Gozzi, and the Austrian ambassador protested. But the storm of indignation that followed compelled the National Council to declare all the sales of the convent property illegal.

In January, 1844, the nuns returned to their convents. Bishop von Muri was acquitted of all fault, and the State condemned in costs. The continuous persecution of their enemies induced the Catholic cantons, perhaps imprudently, to form the Sonderbund. Joseph Leu, one of their most prominent leaders, was basely murdered for his religion by Jacob Müller, who was guillotined for the action. Then followed the war of the Sonderbund. The Catholics, besides their inferiority in numbers, were inferior to their opponents in military skill; and Freiburg first, then Luzerne, then the other cantons, were compelled, in the November of 1847, to yield. The *væ victis* followed. Forty convents were suppressed; the Bishop of Lausanne was imprisoned, and afterwards exiled. Then the reaction began. Good Bishop Marilley did more by his patience and labours in banishment than he could have effected by labouring at home. Catholic newspapers sprang up everywhere. A journal of Catholic art was set on foot. Catholic tracts were published for the poor Romance-speaking mountaineers of the Engadine. Catholic hymns and poems were composed for them. The reader may not be displeased to see a portion of one of the latter, as a specimen both of the feeling and of the language:—

'L'amur da mamma.

- * * * * *
- ' Un sacerdot ad ella s'avizina :
 " Tien figl partit sün volonted divina :
 Guard' Abraham
 Chi sün il clam
 Disch : Dieu, sun pront at der il figl ch' eau am."
- " " Sench hom," replica la adoloreda,
 " Respet tieu dir, ma non rest consoleda :
 Mien figl hè pers,
 E l'Univers
 Non pò, me pü, am der que ch' eau he pers !
- " " Dieu 'l cour da mamma memma bain cognuoscha,
 E me vess El miss quel in taunt anguoscha :
 Ad Abraham
 Fet el il clam :
 Sarah vess dit : ' Mieu Dieu, eau memma l'am.'"

Finally, in Geneva, where, up to 1793, it was *death* to say mass, on Sept. 8, 1859, Bishop Marilley, returned from exile, and assisted by four bishops and 150 secular and regular priests, consecrated the Liebfrauen-Kirche.

The population of Switzerland is given as 882,859 Catholics, as against 1,292,871 Protestants.

We turn to Portugal.

And here we must remember, in the first place, that Portugal

differed most widely from Spain in having been deeply imbued with Gallican, and we fear we must also add with Erastian, views, since the Roman revolution of 1640. At that time Rome, out of complaisance to the Court of Spain, refused bulls for many years to the Bishops named by Dom João IV. (the *ci-devant* Duke of Braganza), and only gave way when a congregation of theologians had declared that, in the case of so obstinate a refusal, bishops might be canonically consecrated without their bulls. Then the influence of the great Pereira in the eighteenth century, and (next to his translation of the Bible) his two most celebrated works, the '*Tentativa Theologica*' (translated into English by Mr. Landon), and the '*Demonstração Theologica*,' led public opinion in the same way. Even to this day, such works as the Catechism of Montpelier (which Rome calls heretical) are text-books in Portuguese schools.

In the civil war of 1829—1833, there can be no doubt that all that was good in the kingdom was on the side of Dom Miguel. The very name, of course, was to Englishmen—*Times*-taught and constitution-adoring Englishmen—a synonym for tyrant. That he was rather a grave, stern man, adored by those that knew him, strictly just, a real lover of the poor, to whom that vile sycophant, Dom Pedro, pandered, by indulging their most brutal propensities, will probably here never be believed. It pleased GOD that the unrighteous cause should triumph. Now it was not in Portugal as in Spain. In Portugal, the monks had held aloof from all political agitation. Pedro wanted money, and so he took it from the monasteries; but he could not say, as Donna Isabella's advisers might with truth, that the religious houses had been against him. However, the decree of May 28, 1834, suppressed all at one stroke. Was Portugal enriched? Not by one *ceitil*.

No country had, in proportion to its size, so many monasteries as Portugal; nowhere was the progress of the nation more bound up with the prosperity of its religious houses. The Benedictine monastery of Lórvão was the first. The valley in which it was situated was then a waste howling wilderness; the monks made it the smiling garden it now is. Well says Diniz:—

'Estas asperezas namoravam os monges, que se com fadigas folgavam: elles mesmos não querião viver senão do trabalho da suas mãos, imitando os Apostolos. O paiz escabroso e deserto, por meio do trabalho dos frades, se tornara ameno e risonho: com o suor do seu rosto foi que elles fecundaram o solo, que hoje é tão fertil.'

Yes; they all fell at one blow: Benedictines, Conegos da Vida Commum, Bernardos, with that historical monastery of Sa. Cruz at Coimbra, Premonstratensians, the Congregation de

Rocha Amador, Franciscans, with their many divisions, Borrás (the Portuguese title for the third order), Observantines, with their four families, S. Francisco da Cidade (black with white girdle), Xabreganos (black with grey girdle), Recollets (grey with grey girdle), Apostolic missionaries do Varatojo (the same, with crucifix on breast)—how we might extend the list! We will only mention the very singular little order called *Pegos Verdes*, which was confined to Algarve. They were laymen, under no vow except of chastity for as long as they remained in their *conventiculo*: they lived by the labour of their hands, and sometimes the whole order consisted only of three persons. They were free to leave their convent when they would, and sometimes did so. They were great favourites with the excellent Bishop of Silves, D. Francisco Gomes de Avellas. They, too, are gone. Batalha, the Westminster of Portugal, with its glorious memories of Aljubarrota; Alcobaça, the finest Cistercian house south of the Pyrenees—it is marvellous how one wicked man's will could, in the teeth of a nation's wishes, prevail to their destruction. Hear what Lorvão is now. The description is from the pen of the celebrated historian Herculano, the first literary man in the Portugal of to-day:—

‘Imagine, meu amigo, uma noite, de inverno, no fundo desta especie do poço perdido no meio da turba de montes que o rodeiam: imagine dezoito ou vinte mulheres idosas mettidas entre quatro paredes humidas e regelladas, sem agasalho, sem lume para se aquecerem, sem pão para se alimentarem, sem energia na alma, e sem forças no corpo, comparando o passado, sentindo o presente, anteendo o futuro. Imagine o vento que rugue, a chuva ou a neve fustigando as poucas vidraças, que ainda restam no edificio: imagine essas orgias tempestuosas da natureza que passam por cima das lagrimas silenciosas das pobres cistercienses: e as horas eternas que batem na torre. Imagine tudo isso, e sentirá accender-se-lhe no animo uma indignação reconcentrada e inflexivel.’

It was only in 1841 that negotiations were again entered into with the Holy See, and the Nuncio Capaccini came to Lisbon to settle a future concordat. In 1843 the Pope gave new bulls to the ecclesiastics nominated to the Patriarchate of Lisbon, the Archbishopric of Braga, and the See of Leiria; but the concordat was not actually signed till after the accession of Dom Pedro V. In 1856 the cholera, in 1857 the yellow fever, ravaged Lisbon, and the exertions of the French Sisters of Charity were ceaseless and marvellously blessed. For this the ‘Liberal’ party has never ceased to persecute them, and has now at last forced them to leave the country. Our own Sisters of Sion House, settled at Lisbon for so many years, have now once more returned to England, where it will be the only conventual establishment which has maintained itself from a period antecedent to the Reformation, with the one exception of

that which till lately was at Spettisbury, but now is in Devonshire: the representatives of S. Margaret at Dartford.

In connexion with the subject of Portugal, we must say a few words on the so-called *Schism of Goa*, and the famous *direito do padroado*.

In 1534, Paul III. by the bull *Æquum reputamus* erected Goa into a see, suffragan to Funchal in Madeira. The Portuguese, as we all know, were at that time the only European power in India, and to the King of Portugal was given the right of patronage in nominating to the See. Paul IV. in 1557 raised it to a metropolitanical rank; he erected the Sees of Cochin and Malacca to be its suffragans, and as before vested the right of patronage in the Crown of Portugal. In 1575, Gregory XIII. founded the See of Macao, also suffragan to Goa, and gave the patronage as before, *but now for the first time with an additional stipulation*; namely, that the King should provide all the funds necessary for the well-being of these sees, and should not permit them to be vacant an unnecessary time. By degrees there were added as suffragans, Funai, separated from Macao (1588), Angomala (1600), Meliapor (1686), separated from Cochin; Pekin and Nankin (1690), separated from Macao. All these were in the patronage of the Crown of Portugal, *sub conditione dotationis et foundationis*, and with the cautela of Gregory XIII. That Crown presently stretched its pretensions further, and considered its consent necessary before any missionary at all could enter the East. Clement VIII. so far gave in to this assumption as to forbid that any missionary should enter Asia except by way of Lisbon and Goa; but Paul V., finding the great inconveniences of the restriction, annulled it. An almost open war broke out between the clergy of Goa and those who entered India by other routes. They stigmatised them as *propagandists*, threw every obstacle in their way, and treated them as open enemies. That clergy, very rich and luxurious, was now scandalously inattentive to its duties. There were at one time three millions of Roman Catholics in India, there is now only one million; whole villages, once Christian, have relapsed into heathenism, and the result is professedly owing to the supineness of the Goan priests.

Innocent XII. found himself in a difficulty with regard to the increasing Church in China. The erection of Pekin and Nankin into bishoprics had not been at all pleasing to the Portuguese monarch, who, if he wished for the *direito do padroado*, had the expense of the institution and maintenance of these sees, and he now absolutely refused to erect any more. The Pope met the difficulty by sending out Vicars-Apostolic, and peremptorily forbade the Diocesan Bishops to exercise any

authority within the new vicariates; a violent aggression on episcopal rights, and an evasion of the original stipulation with the Portuguese monarch. The clergy of Goa, however, whatever were their rights, were conducting themselves in a way which made them the scandal of India. The Bishop of Berytus *in partibus*, being sent by the Supreme Pontiff to investigate the causes of the decline of the Church there, was declared by the Inquisition a rebel against the authority of the Primate, and the faithful were forbidden to hold any spiritual intercourse with him. This kind of struggle went on for some years. The Primate, supported by all the authority of the Viceregal Court, was more than a match for the distant power of Rome. Some of the Papal missionaries submitted to the diocesan authority; some of the Vicars-Apostolic accepted a second nomination from the Primate as his own Vicars-General. Clement X. in 1673 prohibited such acceptance in future; and the brief was forthwith declared, by the Archbishop of Goa and his chapter, surreptitious and apocryphal.

Meanwhile, the power of Portugal fell to pieces, but her kings clung only the more fondly to the right of patronage, though the sees to which they presented were no longer in their possession. The suppression of the Jesuits, in 1773, was the death-blow to the system of Vicariates-Apostolic, and from that period all the power remained with the Primate and his clergy. Most of the latter were Indo-Portuguese, a class for whom the natives entertain the greatest horror. They united the evil qualities of both races, spoke an unintelligible patois, scandalously sold the offices of the Church, even baptism, and contentedly saw Christianity die out in one village after another, and whole tracts of country that once abounded with converts returning to the worship of Vishnu and Siva. In 1778 the Indo-Portuguese clergy were expelled from Bombay on account of their scandalous lives, and the English Government requested the nearest Vicar-Apostolic to take on himself the charge of its Roman Catholic subjects. He obtained authorization from Rome to do so, but the Primate of Goa never ceased to claim jurisdiction at Bombay. In 1791, the East India Company gave notice to the Archbishop that they recognised no authority in him; and he actually wrote to demand from the Pope the expulsion of the Vicar-Apostolic. In the meantime, the Bishoprics of Cranganor, Cochin, and Meliapor remained vacant for half a century.

Gregory XVI. had been, previously to his elevation, Prefect of the Propaganda, and in that capacity was intimately acquainted with the condition of India. In 1832, Cardinal Pedicini notified to the Portuguese ambassador that his master

must either perform his duty by filling the vacant sees, or definitely renounce the right of patronage. Dom Miguel promised attention to the request as soon as the civil war should be at an end. The revolution prevailed, and the Pope, finding that the new Government was in almost open revolt against Rome, at length resolved to act. With the consent of the English Government, he erected a Vicariate-Apostolic in Calcutta (April 18) and in Madras (April 25). The Goan clergy were furious at what they termed the intrusion of the 'Turkish bishops' (they happened to have their titles from places in Turkey). The Chapter menaced with excommunication all who should entertain any relations with them. Attempts were made to render the English Government suspicious of them. But Gregory was not to be turned from his purpose. He instituted the Vicariate of Ceylon, Dec. 23, 1836, and that of Madras June 3, 1837, and at the same time despatched a few Jesuit missionaries to India. The Goanese at this time charged for confessions of one year, two vintens; of two years, a rupee; of three years, two rupees: baptisms cost three vintens. At length, India being torn asunder by an open schism, Gregory XVI. by the brief *Multa præclare* (April 24, 1838) abrogated the decrees of his predecessors, abolished the Sees of Cranganor, Cochin, and Meliapor, marked out the limits of the Vicariates, making them dependent on the See of Rome only, and abolishing the metropolitical rights of Goa. It might have been a necessary step; but still one cannot help seeing in it another instance of the disregard evinced by Rome to diocesan rights.

After the interrupted relations between Rome and Portugal were restored, José Maria da Silva Torres was nominated to the Archbishopric of Goa. In the Consistory of June 16, 1843, it was resolved that the Bull of Institution should be accompanied by letters apostolic, limiting the jurisdiction of the new Archbishop to Portuguese territory only, and that he should swear to observe them, as well as the brief *Multa præclare*. He did so, and sailed to India; but on his arrival at Goa, he ratified all the preceding acts of the Chapter; declared publicly that the Pope had no power to annul the constitutions of his predecessors without the formal consent of the Crown of Portugal; and to strengthen his cause, he ordained no fewer than 800 ecclesiastics of different degrees, men who had been hurriedly educated in the episcopal seminary, and who had little acquaintance with any theological subject except the *jus patronatus*. These men were sent out into the vicariates, and gave considerable scandal.

The Archbishop allied himself closely with Antonio Teixeira, an Augustinian friar, who had been nominated by the Portuguese

Government to the see of Meliapor, but had not been able to procure his bulls. He now visited his diocese, and the opposing parties in some cases came to blows. Gregory XVI. addressed an admonition to the Archbishop, but without effect, and at the time of the death of that pontiff the adherents of Goa were reckoned at 240,000.

Pius IX. endeavoured to procure the recall of the Primate. It was agreed that he should be transferred to an archiepiscopate *in partibus*, he made coadjutor of Braga (which boasts itself, in opposition to Toledo, the primatial See of All the Spains), with the promise of succession: the actual prelate was nearly eighty; besides which, he was to have the lucrative post of Commissioner of the *Bulla do Cruzado*. The Primate certainly could not complain of the terms, and accordingly he became Archbishop of Palmyra, and returned to Portugal. In his allocution to the Cardinals, of Feb. 17, 1851, before naming Da Silva future successor at Braga, the Pope commented in severe terms on the 'schism of Goa;' and a reply to that allocution was printed at Lisbon, and reprinted in Goa.

On receiving official intelligence of the vacancy of the See, the Chapter of Goa elected as Vicar-General the Bishop-designate of Cochin, and named one Antonio Mariano Soares Archdeacon. This ecclesiastic called himself Vicar-General of Goa, in Bombay: five parishes in the city, and six in the island of Salsette, recognised his authority. In Calcutta, Madras, and Meliapor, the party was also strong. But the absence of an Archbishop, and the necessity of applying for confirmation to the Vicars-Apostolic, weakened the national party, and the Chapter summoned the Portuguese Bishop of Macao, Jeronymo José da Matta, to their aid. He landed at Bombay in the February of 1853. He celebrated pontifically, ordained some deacons and subdeacons, and confirmed 150 persons, first preaching at some length on the schism. Thence he went to Cochin and other places, performing episcopal acts everywhere. Doctor Hartmann, Bishop of Derbe *in partibus*, was Vicar-Apostolic of Bombay. He published a protest against the intrusion of the Bishop of Macao, sent a circular to the other vicars requesting their advice in this emergency, and despatched his private secretary with all speed to Rome. The *Bee*, the organ of Goa, continued to chronicle the Bishop of Macao's proceedings in a succession of ovations. He proceeded from Bombay to Goa, where he ordained thirty-one priests and eleven deacons. At length an open rupture occurred in Mahim, a village near Bombay. Doctor Hartmann was about to perform some office in the church, when its curate, of the opposite party, refused to allow him. The civil power was

called in, and endeavoured to eject the Vicar-Apostolic. The latter actually remained a prisoner in the church for a whole month rather than yield possession; a most unedifying spectacle, and one which gave occasion to many a leading article in the local press on the unity of the Roman Church. It was not a little curious, however, to see the *Telegraph* and *Courier*, and the *Bombay Times*, taking part with Bishop Hartmann on the most purely Erastian grounds; that the Roman Church in English territory owed obedience to the Queen and her ecclesiastical authorities; and to hear similar arguments adduced by the Ultramontane party.

In the meantime Bishop Hartmann's circular was receiving answers. Besides the three vicariates—Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay—of which we have spoken, thirteen others had been founded: in the whole sixteen were 303 priests and 670,000 faithful. (The number of Anglican priests, we may observe, at that time was only 131.) The following signed an address, prepared by Bishop Hartmann, requesting the condemnation of the Bishop of Macao, and the excommunication of those priests who refused obedience to the vicariates:—the Vicars-Apostolic of Calcutta, Carew; of Combatore, Bressellac; of Colombo and his coadjutor; of Dacca, Oliffe; of Jaffna; of Madura, Canoz (a Jesuit); of Mangalore, Charronaux; of Pondichery, Bonnaud; of Imla and Verapoly; of Vizagapatam, Neyret. The Vicar of Agra was not asked, *it is said*, because there were no 'schismatics' in his diocese; he of Ava Pegu could not, on account of war, be reached; he of Hyderabad declined signing; he of Madras was silent; he of Patna absent.

In the meantime, Doctor Hartmann's secretary had reached Rome. It was easy to foresee the consequence. A brief was addressed to India, condemning in the strongest terms the Bishop of Macao, and threatening him, Antonio Mariano Soares, and three other priests with excommunication, if they did not submit in two months after the publication of the instrument. On receiving notice of it, the Bishop-designate of Cochin, Vicar-General of Goa, denounced the brief as detestable and apocryphal; forbade the clergy of the diocese to pay any obedience to it; the Portuguese 'Governor-General' rejected it 'with contempt,' as an invasion of the rights of the Crown; and the *Bee* published a series of articles to show that blind obedience to Rome was no part of the duty of a Catholic. The Chambers at Lisbon protested against the brief, which produced a counter-protest from a large body of the clergy, the Bishop of Guarda taking the lead. In India, the possession of the churches was settled by a civil action in the court of Bombay—Bishop Canoz, of Trichinopoly, on the one side; a

priest, with national sentiments, named Arokkianader, on the other—and the judgment was in favour of the Goanese clergy; a heavy blow to the Vicars-Apostolic.

We have already dwelt too long on this episode, and will only add that the schism ran on for six years longer, and has only recently been ended by a Concordat with Dom Pedro. The terms, while leaving the Vicars-Apostolic in possession of the powers for which Rome contended throughout, are not unfavourable to the Crown of Portugal.

Let us now direct our attention to the Church in Bavaria. At the close of the last century, free-thinking and Erastianism were rampant in that land. Maximilian Joseph, who succeeded in 1799, himself a man of no religion, found in the minister Montgelas an unscrupulous agent in impoverishing the Church. Seventy monasteries, some of them on the most magnificent scale, were suppressed at one stroke. Great havoc was made in the cathedral and parish sacristies, which up to that time had been peculiarly rich in works of Christian art. Cardinal della Genga, afterwards Leo XII., had with great trouble almost concluded an arrangement in 1807, when Napoleon interposed, and the Church dragged on a stormy existence till 1817, when at length the Concordat was signed. The oath enforced by the new Constitution caused many scruples among the clergy, which, however, were allayed by the royal proclamation of Sept. 15, 1821; in point of fact, explaining it away. With the accession of Louis, in 1825, happier times began, and Bavaria became the seat of Church art; pity only that, so far as the monarch was concerned, the separation of cultivated taste and pure morality was so complete! A *Society for the Propagation of Good Books* was vigorously supported and extensively useful; and Gorres, Möhler, Dollinger, Reithmayr, and Klee are names which will live in the memory of the Church.

Trèves has during the present century achieved a high reputation for the earnestness and success of its Church-work. Three such succeeding bishops as Sailer, Wittmann, Schwäff are seldom vouchsafed to one see. Partly through their efforts, aided by the, in that respect, excellent disposition of the King, several religious houses have been founded or refounded, especially of Capuchins, Franciscans, and Carmelites; the Redemptorist Fathers and the Brothers of Mercy have been introduced; Sisters of Charity and Sisters of Compassion have numerous convents; while nowhere have the efforts of the Nursery of the Good Shepherd, for the aid of fallen women, been more blessed. The *Ludwigs-Verein*, a society for missions to North America and Asia, has an increasing income and an extending work. Its statutes were published in 1839. Under

her present King, Maximilian, Bavaria presents to the eye one of the bright spots of the Western Church.

We naturally turn next to Prussia. Till the year 1821, though professedly tolerated, and regarded with a kind of contemptuous compassion by successive monarchs, the Church was at a very low ebb. In that year, the bull *De salute animarum*, which concluded an agreement with the State, enabled the almost quenched spirit of Catholic enterprise to break forth anew. The episcopate was set on a different footing. Those curses of mediæval Europe, the prince-bishoprics and elector-primates of Rhine-land, had been swept away for ever, and now in their stead rose the modern Archbishopric of Cologne, with his suffragans of Trèves, Munster, and Paderborn; the Archbishopric of Gnesen-Posen, and the Bishopric of Ermeland. Münster, whose prince-bishop, only 200 years before—the reader may remember Dryden's line,

‘Let Munster's prelate ever be accursed’—

had employed himself in ‘battering down the houses of his flock about their ears, now became the home of a hard-working apostolic bishop, counting his revenue by kreutzers where his predecessor numbered them by florins. In the meantime, the researches of Niebuhr and Bunsen, by calling out the intellectual energies of the Church, gave her real assistance; in the same way that the Tercentenary of the Reformation in 1817 called out Möhler's immortal ‘*Symbolik*.’ The especial studies of the priesthood were directed and furthered by the theological faculty of the University of Bonn, and the *Lyceum Hosianum* for the Diocese of Ermeland and the Catholic Academy of Münster.

But the most remarkable figure in the German ecclesiastical history of the present century is undoubtedly Clement Augustus von Droste, Archbishop of Cologne. He had been Vicar-General of Münster, and while in that position maintained a gallant conflict with the Prussian Government on the subject of theological studies. His predecessor, Ferdinand Spiegel, had been a supporter of Hermesianism, that semi-Pelagian, semi-rationalistic system, which had been condemned by Gregory XVI. in 1835. It had still, however, spread amongst the younger clergy, and Von Droste, in every possible way, endeavoured to stop its further progress. Among other means to this end, he drew up eighteen theses, principally directed against the new heresy, which he required to be signed by candidates for holy orders. The Prussian Government immediately exclaimed that its rights were injured, and peremptorily demanded the recall of the theses. Countless pamphlets

appeared on both sides of the question : at the same time also the question of mixed marriages opened another conflict. A convention had been drawn up between the afterwards notorious Bunsen, on the part of the King, and Archbishop von Spiegel on that of the Church ; by which the latter agreed that the former discipline on the subject of marriages should be relaxed, so as not to be inconsistent with the educational State-minute of 1825. But Bunsen only signed *subject to higher approval* ; Von Spiegel absolutely. Pius VIII., in his short pontificate, condemned the concession ; and Von Droste declared himself unable to follow in his predecessor's steps. He would not, he said, by serving two masters, bring himself to the same deathbed as that of one of his suffragans—it was the Bishop of Trèves—who then bitterly repented, and, as far as he could, undid his unhappy compliance. On this the Government had recourse to the *ultima ratio regum* ; and on Nov. 20, 1837, the brave-hearted prelate was seized, exiled, and imprisoned at Nieuburg. Bunsen, the perpetual reviler of persecutors in all shapes, preferred revenge to consistency.

There arose a burst of indignation from the Roman Catholic world. In an allocution of Dec. 10, 1837, the Pope condemned in the strongest manner the act of the Government, exhorted his beloved brother to stand firm, and praised him in the highest terms. Next Martin von Dunin, Archbishop of Posen and Gnesen, who had already, independently of Cologne, been engaged in the same battle against the ministry, issued a very strongly worded pastoral brief ; on which the *Oberlandesgerichte*, at Posen, pronounced him suspended from office, and condemned him to six months' confinement in a fortress. He was accordingly imprisoned in that of Colberg. From that moment a Catholic reaction took place all over Germany. Addresses without number poured in to the two Archbishops ; the clergy of the archdiocese of Gnesen-Posen, as was fitting, led the way. It happened that a council was assembled at Baltimore when the news of these proceedings reached America, and the archbishop, with twelve of his suffragans, addressed a fraternal letter of sympathy and encouragement to the two confessors. All the Bishops of Prussia were ranged on the same side, with the single exception of Sedlnitzky, Prince-Bishop of Breslau, and he soon afterwards resigned his see.

While matters stood thus, the King died, and was succeeded by Frederick William IV. (June, 1841). This monarch was known to be, theoretically at least, an admirer of the Church ; and his first actions did not disappoint his Catholic subjects. The Archbishop of Gnesen was, in less than two months, notwithstanding the general outcry of the Liberal papers, restored to

his flock. In two pastoral letters he strongly forbade mixed marriages for the future, but recommended that those who had contracted them should, in the confessional and on the sick-bed, be treated with all tenderness. The difficulties for the future were thus solved, the State deprecating them as earnestly as the Bishop; for the past, it must be confessed that the victory lay with the Government. Archbishop von Dunin, to the deep sorrow of all his flock, was taken from the world on S. Stephen's Day, 1842. Before this, however, the King had granted the bishops what had hitherto been denied them, a free resort to Rome.

In Cologne, too, Frederick William acted with considerable nobleness of spirit. The King of Bavaria permitted the Bishop of Spires, Van Geissel, to act as coadjutor of the archdiocese; in order that negotiations might be set on foot with Rome. The Prussian monarch officially disavowed his predecessor's violence. The Archbishop, however, finding his health fail, and weary of strife, resigned his post in a beautiful pastoral, in which he told his people that, if he seemed to retire from the active battle of his diocese, it was only that, like Moses, he might be the better able to lift up his hands for them to heaven. He died October 19, 1845; and to him, undoubtedly—to his firmness and to his sufferings—is to be ascribed the remarkable regeneration of the Church in almost all the great cities of the Northern Rhine; nowhere, however, more remarkable than at Coblentz. The interest which the King took in that noble work, the completion of Cologne, showed his friendly disposition at least to Catholic art; while perfect freedom was guaranteed to the Roman Church in Prussia by the 15th organic article of Dec. 5, 1848.

Let us now glance at the ecclesiastical condition of Rhineland, where the conquests of Napoleon had obliterated all the old landmarks, and his overthrow had destroyed the new *régime*. Von Dalberg, Primate of Ratisbon,¹ the leading ecclesiastic of Germany during the troubles, died in February, 1817. Shortly afterwards the Protestant princes of Germany resolved on a general meeting, for the purpose of an arrangement with Rome regarding the change, or creation of dioceses, now absolutely necessary, from the vast alteration of territorial boundaries, and the mediatization of so many little states. There met at Frankfort-on-Main (March 24, 1818), the ambassadors of Baden, both Hesses, the four Hanseatic towns, Mecklenburg,

¹ Some of our readers will remember the rather striking effigy of this prelate, kneeling on a raised pedestal before a very lofty cross, in the centre of the nave of this cathedral.

Nassau, Oldenburg, Waldeck, and Wurtemberg; those of Wurtemberg and Baden taking, as was natural, the initiative in the deliberations. To the episcopal arrangements consequent on this meeting we have already alluded in the brief sketch we gave of the pontificate of Pius VII. But difficulties presently arose. One of the bishops-designate for the new sees, by name Wessenberg, had already been coadjutor to Von Dalberg at Constance, and the Pope now refused him his bulls. The reason; the See of Rome imagined these prelates to have engaged in common to carry out the so-called *Kirchenpragmatik*, the organic articles proposed by the Protestant states as a kind of concordat, but disapproved by the Pontiff. These matters were finally arranged by Leo XII. in his bull, *Ad Dominici gregis* (April, 1827). In the October of that year Bernard Boll was installed in that lovely cathedral of Freiburg in Breisgau as first archbishop; and the Vicariates-General came to an end. But fresh troubles were at hand. The thirty-nine *Paragraphs* of January, 1830, created a deep sensation all over Germany. By these the offices of the Church were subjected to a *Placet* from the police-office. The bishops tamely yielded; only one generous defender of the liberty of Catholic rites was found to lift up his voice—the free Baron von Hornstein. Pius VIII. in a brief to the prelates of the Upper Rhine for this reproaches them with having obeyed man rather than God. The troubles that followed, and especially the daily encroachments made by the civil power on the rights of his Church, embittered and shortened Archbishop Boll's days; he could not procure the removal of one Reichlin-Meldegg, an almost professed Socinian, from the chair of Catholic Theology at Freiburg.

The stand made by Van Droste, in the neighbouring Prussian territories, quickened the exertions of the Church in Wurtemberg and Baden. The Bishop of Rottenburg brought in a *Motion*, in the second Chamber of the former State, which, under that name, became the watchword of ecclesiastical liberty; it contained nine main articles; which, though rejected at the time, were constantly kept in view by those who succeeded to the strife. In Baden things were worse; for here a section of Catholics were for a free German Church—free, that is, from Rome, but chained to the wheels of the State. At the head of these was Dominic Kuenzer, the pastor of the Spital Kirche at Constance, and he had a strong following at Carlsruhe. But Boll had successors of a different calibre to himself. Archbishop *Demeter* first, and then *Von Vicari*, the present venerable Metropolitan, with whom we have the honour to be slightly acquainted, loved but to act on that famous saying of S. Bernard's, *Nihil magis diligit Deus in hoc mundo quam libertatem ecclesiæ suæ*.

It was hoped that the Baden troubles of 1848, which shattered to pieces the old order of things, would have knapped asunder the chains of the Church; but the complete toleration now given by the great Protestant state, Prussia, was in these comparatively little kingdoms, on various pretences, desired. In the February of 1853, the Metropolitan Von Vicari invited his suffragans of Rottenburg, Mainz, Lemburg, and Fulda, to a conference at Freiburg. The result of this, and a later conference, was a demand of these four points: 1. Free intercourse with priests and laity; 2. Catholic schools; 3. Permission of religious houses; 4. The rights guaranteed to the Church by the Peace of Westphalia. After innumerable difficulties, a convention was drawn up between the King of Wurtemberg and the Apostolic See, in July, 1857, which has, we believe, proved to work well; and another between the Grand Duke of Baden and the same Pontiff, in June, 1859, which gave rise to great troubles, and was explained by a ducal manifesto in the following spring. Affairs in Baden still remain, to a certain extent, unsettled; though in this nation, the Catholics are two to one—in Wurtemberg only one to two. Of all these States we say, in the old rhyme,

Bayern und Pfalz,
Gott erhalt's!

We have entered so fully, on former occasions, into the Church history of Holland and Belgium, that we may omit those states now, and proceed to Austria.

Austria came unprepared to the great struggle, on account of the pseudo-philosophical reforms of the Emperor Joseph. Suppressed and impoverished monasteries, and pedantic routine taking the place of Church education, had not only their usual reward, but actually lost Belgium. The new *régime*, by incorporating the princely domains of the archbishopric of Salzburg into the imperial domain, so far did the Church! good service. If any one wishes to judge for himself how those half-secular, half-religious principalities worked, let him read the second volume of the 'Germania Sacra,' of Hansiz, that which contains the archbishopric of Salzburg. We would refer him especially to the Episcopate of Francis, Count of Harrach, towards the end of the seventeenth century. Hansiz honours him with an eulogy which, so far as words go, would seem rather extravagant if applied to S. Augustine. Yet the fact comes out that, because some poor wretch trespassed on his rights of free warren, this admirable prelate *condemned him to the galleys for life*. It is only right to add that, some years after, he procured the prisoner's liberation.

As Austria returned more nearly than did the other German

States to the old *régime*, there is the less to say of her recent Church history. Notable names therein are Leopold Chlumczansky, first Bishop of Leitmentz, and then Archbishop of Prague; the Count von Firmain, Archbishop, first of Salzburg, then of Vienna; and, above all, F. X. Salin, Bishop of Grork. The Jesuits re-entered in 1820; the Redemptorists in 1816. In September, 1822, the Archbishop of Gran called together a National Court of Hungary. That primacy is the richest in the world; till 1848 it averaged 50,000*l.* a year; in that year the Diet framed an act which diminished it, proportionately with the other sees, to about 34,000*l.* Surely it may be doubted whether, in the present state of things, such extravagant wealth is good for the Church. The most important event of late is the recent Concordat, the ceaseless object of insult to Protestant papers.

We have still, to take a fair view of the ecclesiastical history (in its widest sense) of modern Europe, two more papers to write: whether they shall appear or not must depend on the wishes of our readers.

The first would contain a sketch of the exclusively Protestant countries, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Finmark, with the Protestant and Reformed communities of Germany.

The second, the struggles of the Roman Church in the border lands between herself and the East; Wallachia, Moldavia, Dalmatia, Bulgaria,—above all, Poland.

The reader will observe, that, except so far as the Papal See is concerned, we have made no mention of Italy. The fact is, we dare not allow ourselves to speak of the present contest. We are not speaking of the question of the suppression of the Pope's temporal power, but of the sacrilege and confiscation which have followed in the rear of Sardinian aggression and success.

That mere Protestants should see in every aggression on Rome a matter of thankfulness, is not surprising. That mere Anglicans should see in the hankering of modern Chambers after the wealth of the Church a disposition to receive an 'Italian Reformation,' is not an unparalleled blindness. But that the general run of Church journals, here and in America, can speak with such nonchalance of the awful, the wholesale sacrilege—the destruction and suppression of monasteries that had stood from the seventh century,—how can we account for it? And that Englishmen, who have cursed the atrocities of the French Revolution, can complacently view such diabolical butcheries as the massacre of Pontelandolfo, to which the Noyades of Nantes, or the Fusillades of Lyons scarcely form a parallel, proves the maxim of the end sanctifying the means to be conveyed in the present day. One question only we will ask.

Can any one deny, has any one attempted to deny, these facts?

The Sardinians and their allies have, on an average, killed fifty persons daily, thus making a total of about 10,000 of the *brigands* and their friends. Setting aside the losses suffered in the six months' campaign which followed the destruction of Gaeta, the combats in the Abruzzi, and the many massacres in other places, the victims of Piedmont must amount, at least, to 60,000. The families of 6,000 officers and 50,000 *employés* are reduced to misery. Skirmishes of all kinds, destruction of grain, dearth of food, increase of taxes, attacks on religion and the clergy, suppression and desecration of convents, add to the miseries of the unhappy country.

And now we would refresh ourselves and our readers by looking away from the poor schism-rent Church as she is, to that which she was intended to be, to that which she will be, as we verily believe, on earth; as we know, in Heaven!

‘Jerusalem, quæ ædificatur ut civitas : cujus participatio ejus in idipsum. Illuc enim ascenderent tribus, tribus Domini : testimonium Israel, ad confitendum nomen Domini.

Quia illic sederunt sedes in judicio : sedes super domum David.

Rogate quæ ad pacem sunt Jerusalem : et abundantia diligentibus te.

Fiat pax in virtute tua : et abundantia in turribus tuis!’

- Art. IX.—1. *Chronicles of the Ancient British Church previous to the Arrival of S. Augustine.* Second Edition. Wertheim and Mackintosh.
2. *S.-Paul in Britain; or, the Origin of British as opposed to Papal Christianity.* By the REV. R. W. MORGAN. J. H. and J. Parker.
3. *The Cave in the Hills, or Cæcilius Viriathus—Wild Scenes among the Celts—The Alleluia Battle; or, Pelagianism in Britain,* being Nos. I. V. and XIV. of Messrs. Parker's 'Historical Tales.'
4. *The Celt, the Roman, and the Saxon: the History of the early Inhabitants of Britain down to the Conversion of the Anglo-Saxons to Christianity.* By T. WRIGHT, M.A. F.S.A. Second Edition. Hall, Virtue & Co.
5. *De Ecclesiasticæ Britonum Scotorumque Historiæ Fontibus disseruit Carolus Gulielmus Schöll.* Berolini, 1851.

IF British Church history is obscure, and if almost every current belief about it is an error, it is certainly not for want of writers on the subject. It has suffered, indeed, more than any other chapter in ecclesiastical history, from the combination of scanty evidence, with a more than usual amount of polemically useful legend. Celtic patriotism has combined with Protestant zeal to obscure its native sources to an unprecedented extent with spurious documents and uncertified fables. And the few allusions of foreign writers which afford the chief trustworthy evidence of its earlier period, leave ample room for uncritical supplementing or for baseless theorizing. Roman Catholic historians, from Parsons and Alford downwards, have done their best to construct a case for Papal supremacy out of legends mainly of foreign origin. And as for home authorities, an intelligent sifting of Welsh ecclesiastical documents, in the spirit with which Mr. Stephens has handled those of a secular character, is still a desideratum. While the præ-Niebhrian platitudes of Bishop Burgess still seem to hold their ground in dealing with the classical, or rather the patristic, and other (so-called) testimonies to the fabulous British journey of S. Paul.

The abundant crop of recent publications on the subject afford symptoms of a wiser and more intelligent spirit. It is true that even in this nineteenth century the extremes of credulity and of scepticism still seem to meet. A magnificent but somewhat heterodox creation of a mighty Druidical Christian Church, dating from S. Paul, and located in Britain, the great preserver of primitive truth, the independent source of an anti-Italian

orthodoxy, the one intellectual and organized force in the world that could compete with the classical mind, the great co-ordinate element with Greek and Latin civilization;—such is the vision that possesses the whole Celtic soul of Mr. Morgan,¹ to the sad confusion of his critical powers. In the latter part of his volume, again, the Anglican has superseded the Welshman, and our domestic and Protestant feelings are touched by a family picture, worked out into details almost like a novel, even to the name and church of the family clergyman, in which (but upon the rotten foundation, alas! of menologies and martyrologies) a detailed account of S. Paul's mission to Britain, whence he started, and whither he returned, and who helped to further his journey, is set forth to our wondering eyes. On the other hand, the valuable and learned volume of Mr. Wright, turning aside for a moment from his proper subject on which he speaks with authority, coolly denies the existence of any British Church at all, upon no other grounds than such as (according to the old contrast in Thucydides) would obliterate also Spartan history from that of Greece; the alleged absence, namely, in this nineteenth century of any material traces of Christianity in the existing antiquarian remains of the third and fourth. We pass by, again, the flat pages of Mr. Thackeray, and the bookmaking precipitancy of Dr. Giles, who have treated us to formal histories (so called) of the British Church, to confess that English imagination has for once equalled that of the Welsh. The localizing of King Lucius at Gloucester, as the first and original impersonation of the perfect theory of Church and State, such is the fruit of the Gloucestershire zeal of Mr. Lysons, who has inherited the tastes of his antiquarian ancestor, but with them also the uncritical swallow of the last generation. Nor can Archdeacon Williams, or Mr. Bowles, or Mr. Lysons himself, establish more than a bare possibility for the parallel story of Claudia and Pudens; or bring forward that 'almost any proof of it,' which still is requisite, according to Butler's shrewd remark, to overcome 'the presumption of millions to one against' any supposed individual story imagined to have happened. Nay, two worthy Welsh clergymen have literally been found, of whom one, in 1812, affirmed the island to which S. John the Evangelist was banished, to have been Britain itself, while the other,

¹ We stand aghast at the coolness of many of Mr. Morgan's statements. He tells us e.g. what happened at the conference of the oak, as if he had been there to see and hear. And throughout he is so very circumstantial, beyond any poor knowledge of ours, that we can only suppose that, in addition to believing literally all he finds in print or in MS. that agrees with his own views, he has also discovered some unknown contemporary historians and biographers. The one merit of his book is his account of Druidical theology, unsatisfactory as telling us nothing of his sources, and so not enabling us to judge when this system existed, and on what authority it rests, but very interesting nevertheless. Historically, his book is ludicrously worthless.

in this very year of grace, 1861, believes in the Somersetshire voyage of Joseph of Arimathæa. But the marks of a more historical and larger temper may be traced in some of the publications named at the head of this article. The excellent 'Chronicles of the Ancient British Church,' though both wordy in style and open to historical criticism, and omitting the larger half of their subject, viz. the post-Saxon period, are a decided improvement upon Mr. Williams' 'Ecclesiastical Antiquities of the Cymry,' which itself is a book to be named with respect. And Messrs. Parker's 'Tales,' Nos. I. and XIV., avoiding, for the most part, the prosy inventiveness of those (from the pen of Archdeacon Evans) which preceded them, depict, with a very large amount of careful and self-controlled historical accuracy, the two eras in the history of the earlier British Church, which are the turning-points of that history, and about which we have most knowledge, or least ignorance. While Mr. Blight has done a humbler but even more useful service, by supplying us with a portion of the facts which lie at the foundation of the case, in an elaborate account, illustrated by excellent engravings, of the wonderfully copious Christian remains in Cornwall.¹ The German writers err, no doubt, on the side of scepticism. M. Schöll actually dissolves S. Patrick himself into a myth. Yet his careful and vigorous inquiries have, perhaps, given more real impetus to the study by the fresh spirit they inspire into it, than could be accomplished by any actual enlargement of our knowledge. He has certainly put us upon the right track for the due estimate of our witnesses. Of other foreigners, *e.g.* of Münter, it is rather matter of surprise that they should know so much, than that want of familiarity with a country not their own should betray them into error. And Münter in particular, where he is in error, has been mainly led into it by trusting to the strangest of all books wherein to find a really learned ecclesiastical inquiry, Toland's 'Nazarenus.' If the Englishman confounded the twelfth century with the sixth and seventh, and the Irish opponents or correspondents of S. Bernard, or Malachi, or Archbishop Lanfranc, with the immediate followers of S. Patrick, the German may be excused for following his lead. And, after all, the few pages of another German, viz. Lappenberg, on the subject, are more pregnant with solid, accurate, and intelligent knowledge than most of the laboured works of even Englishmen. One native work, however, claims still the pre-eminence. From the entire accumulation of modern writers, we must fall back to this day upon the old and won-

¹ It appears by Mr. Blight's valuable publication, that there are no less than 185 crosses still remaining in Cornwall. The singular chapels in the same locality occupy his attention also. And Mr. Haslam's valuable labours on the same subject should not be forgotten.

derful book of Archbishop Ussher, whose omniscience swept together almost all that was in his days to be found of print or MS. upon the subject in hand, while his shrewdness and deep learning anticipated and avoided pretty nearly all the errors that have misled one or other of his successors.¹

The truth is, that until the labours of such scholars as O-Conor, and more recently, Dr. Reeves (and they have scarcely touched the *foreign* department of the subject), the attention of British writers had been devoted almost exclusively to the præ-Saxon period of British Christianity, and in that period to the legends mainly respecting its origin, and to the attempt to unite or dis sever it from the Christianity of Rome. Credulity seized upon a statement respecting the Apostle of the Gentiles, which is only so far better grounded than a like statement respecting S. Peter himself, in that an Eastern writer of the seventh century is, as an evidence to such a fact, somewhat less absurd than one of the tenth. A superficial knowledge, stumbling over and misapprehending the difference between the Roman and British Easter-cycle, blundered into a more rational-looking conjecture, and traced the genealogy of the British Church, whether through Lyons or not, to S. John and Asia Minor. And the ingenuity of most writers on the subject has been wasted accordingly upon laboured arguments directed to that most impossible of historical tasks, the creation of evidence that does not exist. Meanwhile, the really instructive portion of Celtic Church history—that which follows the Saxon invasion—and the real body of evidence which that portion of it affords, not, indeed, to an opposition to the Papal supremacy—such an anachronism in controversy would defeat itself by implying the existence of the claim to which an opposition was necessary—but to a simple unconsciousness of it;—all this has been almost forgotten, or only cursorily and inaccurately noticed, or, indeed, to most English students simply unknown. A Scot was a name looked up to with reverence throughout the whole north-west continent of Europe, in the sixth and seventh centuries, by Christians of every grade. A Scotch (a term extending to Ireland and Scotland both, not excluding Welsh Bangor either)—a Scotch education was that which was then sought by those who would become learned divines, by Franks and Burgundians, as well as by native Celts, nay by Anglo-Saxons, and that, too, of the Wilfrid school. A national character, and a certain line of thought, and feeling, and a peculiar rule of life, and writers of their own, and abundant other characteristics are in this period

¹ Dr. Hook could have escaped almost all his many blunders respecting the British Church, had he turned to Ussher. The archbishop's book is the most perfect specimen extant of an exhaustive collection of the whole facts of a case intelligently handled.

traceable upon sufficient evidence ; scanty and fragmentary, indeed, compared with the full daylight of later times, but enough to supply tangible and instructive results. And the Scot or Celtic Churchman becomes an important character, to whom the historian can assign a definite image and form upon his canvass. The history of the Celtic Churches becomes worth studying, because by this time it is a history, and not a mere collection of fragmentary allusions to the bare existence (or little more) of a Church at all. Yet, from this really interesting part of the subject, English writers have turned away, and idle debates about futile legends have taken the place of a real history of a living and native Church.

To attempt to sketch the subject here indicated would far exceed the limits of the present paper, yet enough may be said to call attention to it. The history of Columbanus has taken M. Montalembert across a portion of the same ground ; and foreign Church historians have been led to the foreign part of it, partially and incidentally, by their subjects, as *e.g.* Mabillon in older times, and more recently Hefele, in his 'History of the Introduction of Christianity into South-west Germany ;' but abundant materials still remain to be gathered ; and it is a pity that it does not engage as a whole the undivided labours of some English student of Church history. The documents on which it is founded would find their appropriate place in any documentary collection relating to the British Church.¹ And many, no doubt, still lie concealed in German or Swiss, or other foreign libraries. It would be a task that would repay the inquirer, to divert his attention from the proverbially legendary matter that constitutes at present Welsh and Irish history (so called), whether secular or ecclesiastical, and to collect and digest the real history of the Celtic Churches, both at home and abroad, when in their prime.

We distinguish, then, in tracing the *origines* of our native Church, two sharply-contrasted periods. Up to the time of the departure of the Romans, such Christianity as existed among us, weak at best, and scantily spread, appears to have been confined mainly, if not exclusively, to Roman settlements and Romanized natives, and to have struck, in consequence, but feeble roots in the land. It was foreign, not native ; it was confined to the Roman provinces of Britain itself ; it had no

¹ The British portion of Wilkins' 'Concilia' is among the most crude and incomplete of any part of the work. It would be a great improvement to any future edition of the book merely to recast this portion of it. It would be a still greater, if practicable, to add such documents as illustrate the history of the later Celtic Churches. A large collection was made of foreign evidence upon the subject, from the Vatican, and from S. Gall, among other places, for the use of the Record Commission, which is still lying unused in London. Pity that materials, so inaccessible in general in the libraries where they lie hid, should have been laboriously collected, simply to lie idle.

strength or character of its own, but was a feeble reflection of its Gallic sister across the channel, from whom almost certainly it was derived. Its history is confined almost to the mere fact of its existence, or is, at best, a skeleton of dates, filled up almost by negatives. It was a Church, up to this period, which had produced no one known writer except Pelagius and the semi-pelagian Fastidius; and of these the first certainly, and almost certainly the second, lived and wrote abroad;—a Church which had contributed nothing beyond a silent vote to any ecclesiastical movement whatever, and had lain open to the subtle machinations of the metaphysical Easterns, through the simplicity of her ignorance;—a Church, the first utterance of whose voice, when she found one, was in the form of the fiercest possible denunciations of her own shortcomings and of those of her people, in the well-known complaint of Gildas;—a Church that had hitherto sent no missions; for even Palladius, Patrick, Ninian, who date also at the very close of the period, were sent by S. Martin of Tours and by the Bishop of Rome;—a Church which, when assailed by heresy, was compelled to send to her neighbours for a fit champion of the truth;—a Church that looked to Gaul for the saints whom she should follow and reverence, and by whose names she should call her sacred buildings, Hilary, Martin, Germanus, and whose own almost single saint was only a convert and a martyr in the same day, if his story indeed can be trusted at all—a Church that has left a trace indeed (we affirm it against Mr. Wright), but the very faintest trace of her two centuries and a half of existence, in brick or stone, in sculpture or in inscription:—a Church too poor to endow even her own bishops;—a Church which, so far (it was different afterwards), had no traceable customs or ritual peculiar to herself;—a Church which, in a perhaps happy obscurity, on the one hand, escaped persecutions with but one probably small exception;² but on the other

¹ The special customs traceable at a later time, the peculiar Latin translation of parts of the Bible of which the existence is discernible through Gildas' quotations, and those of the Confession, &c. of S. Patrick, and the well-known though perpetually mistaken peculiarities respecting Easter and the tonsure, are all referable solely to the natural effect of isolation from other Churches—that is to say, there is nothing, or next to nothing, in them bearing internal evidence of being derived from other Churches. With respect to the Easter Cycle and the tonsure, this is demonstrable. It seems to be the case with the other points also, although the Bible translation, singularly enough, contains passages seemingly agreeing with a translation used by Lucifer of Cagliari. One is at a loss to see any possibility of connexion between Britain and Sardinia.

² The evidence of the life of Germanus, written before 500, and of Gildas and Venantius Fortunatus about two-thirds of a century afterwards, appear sufficient to establish the *fact* of the martyrdom of S. Alban, probably about 303. The extent of the persecution in England is exaggerated by Gildas, merely by his unauthorized transfer of the language of Eusebius unchanged to his own pages. The position of Constantius, and the evidence of Sozomen, sufficiently establish the fact that in England there was hardly any persecution at all.

(omitting, indeed, the heretic Pelagius), formed no school, threw no new light on the truth, supplied no commentaries on Scripture, devised no religious or charitable institute, added nothing of any kind to the common stock;—such is the view which a reasonable criticism gives us of the Church of Britain up to the Saxon invasion of her shores. Small trace, so far, either of a special offshoot of the peculiar Asiatic school with which S. John's name is associated, or of a Church lighted up with a blaze of light through contact (as Mr. Morgan will have it) with the one Western centre of the primeval faith, more impregnated with truth than the Jewish faith itself, with Druidism! Far more consistent is it with historical indications to suppose, that the British Churches were simply offshoots of the neighbour Churches of Gaul, and that they had not, up to this date, spread largely among the native population, but had been confined mainly to the poorer class of that mixed race of immigrants which clustered round the chief Roman colonies.

A very different picture meets the inquirer in the subsequent period. Turn to the pages of Gildas, and we find there plain traces first of a National Church. The inconstancy, the headlong impulse, the hasty outbursts of frantic wickedness which he imputes so roundly, are the faults of a Celtic people. One could not desire a better proof of the genuineness of Gildas (assailed, like that of his Church itself, by Mr. Wright) than the agreement between the society which he depicts and that which Welsh legends and history, *e.g.* the *Liber Landavensis*, describe in details. And that Church, again, is one spread over the whole nation, organised, endowed, having churches and altars, the three orders of the ministry, monastic institutions, embracing the people of all ranks and classes. It had spread, moreover, into Ireland and Scotland, and into Brittany. It was also a learned Church. It had its own version of the Bible—its own ritual. Its learned men even knew Greek, so far at any rate as to make bad Latin worse by a sprinkling of Greek words. Look again yet further than Gildas, and the Celtic Churches have taken a more distinct and a far nobler position still. They have become in the sixth and seventh centuries not only the Church of the people and land of all the British isles, including gradually within the sphere of their influence almost the whole of Saxon as well as Celtic England; but they are now the leading Churches of northern Europe, the great centre of learning, the prolific hive of missions, and the focus of devotional feeling for all Christians north of the Alps, except where Italy still kept an opening for herself through the southern portion of France, and by the help of the Catholic Franks. They have assumed, from the outward tonsure to the inward spirit, a substantive and vigorous character of their own. It is

dangerous to speculate upon the issues of contingencies that have not happened. Yet Church historians cannot be far wrong in saying that a mere turn of the scale, humanly speaking, prevented the establishment, in the seventh century, of an aggregate of Churches in North-western Europe, looking for their centre to the Irish and British Churches, and as entirely independent of the Papacy as are the English-speaking Churches of the present day. The Celtic skull and the Celtic temperament, we are told by naturalistic ethnologists, are perforce Romanist. We commend the fact to notice, that the largest and most powerful combination of European orthodox Churches not paying obedience to the Roman See at any period anterior to the Reformation, consisted of the entire aggregate of the Celtic Churches existing at the time, with the addition of a body of Celtic missions among Teutonic tribes.

A few words will sketch, though very imperfectly, the outline of the important part then played by the Churches (as they have been called) of the British Confession. From the middle of the fifth to the middle of the ninth centuries (c. 450—850), a combination of Churches arose, culminated, and finally melted into the Communion of their opponents, differing from the then Roman Church in ritual, but not in doctrine; having drifted, indeed, by mere lapse of time into such divergences as inevitably result from discontinuance of intercourse, but nothing more: having their own Liturgy, their own (in part at least) Latin translation of the Bible, their own mode of chanting, their own monastic rule, their own missions, their own succession of bishops, lastly, their own old-fashioned but erroneous cycle for observing Easter; unconscious, at the time of the severance,¹ of any submission due to the bishops of Rome, and unhesitatingly repudiating it when circumstances brought it before them;² and (as their legendary lives of saints show,) gazing

¹ The statement of Giraldus Cambrensis, that the synods of Llandewi Brefi and of Victory, which, according to the common story, suppressed Pelagianism in Wales in the sixth century, were confirmed by the authority of the Roman Church, is relied upon (e.g. by Kunstmann) as proving the submission of the British Church to the Pope in that century. It simply proves that the Britons looked up to Rome in the days of Rhyddmerch in the tenth century, whose 'Life of S. David' is Giraldus' sole authority, the latter having done no more than translated Rhyddmerch's bad Latin into (as he conceived) an elegant style—a style, by the way, about as much superior to Rhyddmerch's as would just constitute the difference between being rejected or not at an Oxford examination of the present day. But in Rhyddmerch's time, Bishops of S. David's had come to look for consecration to the Saxon Archbishops of Canterbury, and of course looked up to the see of Rome as much as they did. And, beyond doubt, the anti-papal attitude of the Britons, A.D. 600, which rests upon Bede and other indubitable testimony, is quite enough to show that the two words on the subject in Rhyddmerch ('Romana auctoritate') represent his own feeling and no more. Indeed, his 'Life of S. David' is a pure legend throughout, and is historical evidence, therefore, in respect to the writer, but not in respect to his subject.

² Columbanus professes respect to Rome as 'Caput Ecclesiarum,' but 'salva loci

fondly back to that which had formed the cynosure of Christian eyes at the time when Barbarian conquest first cut them off from southern Christendom, viz. to Jerusalem and the Holy Land, rather than to (although not to the exclusion of) the apostolic threshold of Papal Rome. The great break-up of Roman Gaul in the middle of the fifth century, which thrust a barrier of savage Paganism between the general community of Christendom and the British Isles, and as a part of the same movement the Saxon invasion of Britain itself, mark the commencement, as they formed the causes of the ecclesiastical phase of which we speak. The great Irish monasteries, and the triple catalogue of Irish saints upon which Ussher comments, and S. Columba and the Culdees of Icolmkill, with, in a less degree, the half wasted churches of Wales and Cornwall, constituted its heart, and the centres of the Christian life which radiated from it. The mission of Columbanus (c. 590), and shortly after of S. Gall, and of many other Scotch missionaries, to Lorraine, Franche Comté, and Switzerland, and the all but complete absorption of Anglo-Saxon Christianity into the Scoto-Irish Church, prior to the Conference at Whitby in 664, were its culminating points. The colonization of Brittany (c. 450), the foundation of the Irish monastery of Bobbio, near Pavia, among the Arian Lombards by Columbanus (c. 600), the Scotch monasteries at Ratisbon and Vienna,—the brave missions of holy men unnamed on earth to Faroe and to Iceland—and the establishment of a British colony and a British bishopric, occupied by Mailoc, in Spanish Galicia (c. 570), a kind of Gibraltar geographically, though in no other sense, to the British Churches,—point to its furthest local extent. And while the names of Wilfrid and of Theodore mark its decadence in Britain, and that of Boniface its more violent suppression in Germany and Switzerland; yet traces of Irish feeling linger on in Brittany, and in France generally, until at least the beginning of the ninth century, if not later,¹ while in Ireland

Dominicæ Resurrectionis singulari prærogativa. In other words, he places his relation to Rome in the same category with his relation to Jerusalem, and reckons both to be simply entitled to reverence, not to canonical obedience; and even so, Jerusalem first and Rome second. And no one can read Columbanus' letters without perceiving that the idea of the papal supremacy in the modern sense had never entered his head.

¹ The decree of Louis. le Debonnaire respecting the Breton Abbey of Landerenech in the beginning of the ninth century, marks the date of the absorption of Scotch or British monastic rule and tonsure into the Benedictine in Brittany. But in southern France the white robe of Columbanus is usually but erroneously said to have given way to the black robe of the Benedictines, and with the garb all other peculiarities likewise, at an earlier date still. Mabillon, indeed, dates their disappearance in Columbanus' own (Italian) Abbey of Bobbio, as early as 628, but upon evidence that does not by any means bear out the inference he draws from it. As regards France, Lappenberg cites a respectful mention by the French bishops of the *Hospitalia Scottorum* in 846. And Joannes Scotus, at the end of

the fusion of the Churches was not complete until the Norman Conquest of the country by Henry II., some four hundred years later. Externally measured, the extent of the non-Roman Communion thus described well-nigh balanced that which remained on the Roman side. For Ostrogoth and Lombard Arians in succession overran Italy itself during nearly the whole of the sixth and seventh centuries, and Arian Visigoths occupied Gaul first, and then Spain, for a considerable portion of the same period; leaving the Catholics in Italy and Spain, and the Churches of the Frank kingdom and of the now (after 517) Catholicised Burgundians, and later still (597), the Anglo-Saxon mission, and we suppose we must throw in Illyricum, to form the entire Papal Communion in Europe. But the internal by no means corresponds to the external parallel with modern divisions of the European Churches, above suggested. The absence at that time of any doctrinal or essential difference, and the externality of those differences which existed—the weight of superior civilization in both arts and literature thrown wholly into the scale of Rome,—imperial as well as ecclesiastical associations, attaching themselves to the same side—the power of centralization belonging to the Papacy, but wanting to its rivals,—all combined with the course of political events (as *e.g.* the rise of Anglo-Saxon and of French power on the two sides respectively of the Channel), to give a different issue of the contest from that, which a different chain of conditions prognosticates, we hope, for its modern reproduction. But the value ecclesiastically speaking of the position which these Churches occupied, does not depend upon the success with which they maintained it. The fact still retains its force, that they had been simply unconscious of Papal claims at the period of their isolation. And, like the unburied sculptures of some Ninevite mound, the attitude in which they are found upon their renewed contact with the world without, affords unimpeachable evidence of their real ecclesiastical position at the time when they were first shrouded in the obscurity of their northern tomb from the eyes of southern Europe.

Various theories have been devised to account for the position thus occupied by the British Churches. M. Schöll, out of his own head, supposes a substitution, in the fifth century, in the place of the older British Church, how accomplished he does not say,

that century, is a proof in his own person both of the respect paid to Scottish learning still, and of Scottish claims to that respect. (We cannot forbear transcribing, by the way, for our readers' amusement, the account of Scotus given in a recent compendium of English history:—'He resided in the court of Charles the Bold. He was afterwards made by Alfred, head of Brasenose and was at last assassinated by robbers in Malmesbury Abbey.') Single immersion in baptism, which is conjectured to have been a Scotch or British practice, lingered on in Brittany until the seventeenth century—so Martene informs us.

of a new Christianity derived from the East. The general current of writers, except Roman Catholics, encouraged by supposed polemical reasons, push back this alleged oriental foundation to the earliest original of any British Church at all; and mainly through a pure blunder respecting the British Easter controversy, conjecture a mission to our shores from Asia Minor. And while writers like Parsons and Alford, or even Lingard and Kunstmann, try to make polemical capital out of the apocryphal story of Pope Eleutherus and King Lucius, those of an opposite school, in the supposed interests of Protestantism, have clutched at the equally baseless story of S. Paul's visit to Britain. And now comes Mr. Morgan, though largely ignorant of the actual facts of Celtic Church history, but with, as far as we know, an original theory, to claim for the Druidical element the credit of this non-Roman independence. Unfortunately, not one of these hypotheses accounts for the facts of the case, and not even the least wild among them rests upon reliable evidence, or is consistent with the evidence that exists. Neither an Eastern, nor a Papal, nor a Pauline, nor a Druidical origin will account for the phenomena of a Church, that had no Eastern customs, knew of no canonical subjection due to the Pope, differed in no way doctrinally, or in the first instance ritually, from European Christendom in general, was singularly free from metaphysical speculations, and though given rather to those practical views which developed into Pelagianism, yet originated no special doctrinal views of her own, true or false, upon any subject whatever. While of evidence to support these several theories we must affirm that there is simply none.

A fair survey of what is really known, will show, we believe, that the more natural supposition of the simple spread of the Gospel from the Gallic Churches to their British neighbours, modified as time went on by the successive historical conditions of the British people, is the only reasonable result, and a perfectly adequate explanation, of the whole of the facts.

We turn, then, to the earlier portion of the history we are considering, with the purpose of reviewing concisely the real amount of that evidence upon which our modern writers dilate at such full length, and build such airy palaces. If a review of British Church *history* would take us rather to the far more interesting field we have above indicated, a review of British Church *historians* must call back our attention to the duller and more disputed period of which we first made mention.

The earliest reliable testimony to the existence of a British Church at all, is to be found in the words of Tertullian, c. A. D. 208; rhetorical, no doubt, but sufficiently precise to show the writer's belief, as in a well known fact, that there were then Christians in Britain. The passage, however, was probably

written at a time when the Emperor Severus was engaged, but had not yet succeeded, in quelling a British revolt. And the phrase, *Romanis inaccessa loca*, therefore, does not affirm the existence of Christianity external to what had been, and shortly was again, the Roman province, but simply that Christian missionaries had succeeded, where Roman soldiers, at that moment, had failed. Some twenty years subsequent to Tertullian, Origen repeats a like testimony more than once. But it is at the same time stated, in a homily attributed to Origen, and at least not of earlier date, that the Gospel at that time had not even been preached to the greater part of the Britons—*plurimi* (among the Britons, as well as other nations, such as the Moors) *nondum audiverunt evangelii verbum*. From the time of Constantius Chlorus and the year 300, it becomes superfluous to dwell upon testimony to so indisputable a fact as that of the existence of a British Church, of some extent or other. Even if Mr. Wright persists in requiring the literal bricks and stones of Christian churches or monuments, we trust to satisfy him before we have done. But for more reasonable inquirers, the list of authorities in the note¹ will amply suffice. We rather hasten to reply to the less preposterous question, how we come to deny the existence of evidence to such a Church earlier than Tertullian?

The absence of evidence is, in itself, a sufficient ground for withholding assent from any historical theory. In the present case there appears to exist, also, counter evidence to disprove that theory. Of course, no one would take upon him to affirm, that no single Christian man found his way to Britain before the year 200. The legitimate conclusion from the evidence is simply, that there was no formed Church there before some date close upon that year. Now there are one or two statements of good authors which appear to prove this. Irenæus, for instance, about A.D. 176, enumerating the several Churches of Christendom, and dwelling with some particularity upon his own neighbours, knows of Churches in northern and western Europe only among the Germans (the *Germaniæ* of the Roman Empire), the Iberians, and the Celts. And the latter term in Irenæus, as in Cæsar, means indisputably, not the Britons, but exclusively and properly *Gallia Cel-*

¹ Act. Concil. Arelat., A.D. 314, ap. Labb. I. 1430; Constantini Epist. ad Eccles. ap. Euseb. Vit. Const. iii. 17, 19; Euseb. Demonstr. Evang. iii. 5; S. Athanas. ad Jovian. Imperat. (Op. II. 761), Apol. c. Arian. (I. 123), Hist. Arian. ad Monach. (I. 360); S. Hilar. Pictav. de Synodia, in Prolog.; Sulp. Severus, Hist. Sac. II. 55; S. Chrysost., c. Judæos (Op. I. 575, Montf.); Serm. de Util. Lect. Script., in Epist. ad Cor. II. Hom. XXVIII., Serm. in Pentecost. (possibly spurious); S. Jerom., Ad Evangelium (Op. IV ii. 803), Ad Heliodorum (ib. 267), Orthod. et Lucif. Dial. (ib. 298), Ad Ctesiph. adv. Pelag. xliii. (ib. 481), Ad Paulam (ib. 551), Ad Paulinum (ib. 564), Ad Oceanum (ib. 662); Palladius. Hist. Lausiæ, cxviii.; Theodoret, Philoth. xxvi., De Legg. ix.; Prudentius, *Περὶ Χρηστων*, xiii. 103. We might enlarge the list considerably from writers further on in the fifth century.

tica, Irenæus' own locality, and the known seat, at that time, of many Churches; though (if we may trust the traditions respecting the Lyonnese persecutions, which are not likely to fall short of the truth) of none, at that time, further north than Langres. Sulpicius Severus, again, a late authority (A.D. 400), but of some weight respecting Gallic history, asserting the well-known Lyonnese martyrs of what he calls the fifth persecution (166—179) to have been the first martyrs in Gaul, explains his statement by the remark—'serius trans Alpes Dei religione suscepta.' And if not 'across the Alps,' then much less across the British Channel. The best evidence, indeed, postpones the entire christianizing of even Gaul to the middle of the third century. On the other hand, the obscure words of Gildas, assigning the introduction of the Gospel into Britain to the reign of Tiberius, upon which so much ingenious criticism has been wasted, and which are repeated, *usque ad nauseam*, by every compendium writer of English Church history, are simply (as Ussher hints, and M. Schöll proves) an extension of certain words of Eusebius, unwarranted by the original, so as to include Britain within their scope. Gildas himself, writing in the sixth century, avowedly knows nothing of the early history of the Church of his own country, beyond what he had found, or fancied he found, in foreign writers, and mainly in the Latin translation of Eusebius; for the simple reason assigned by himself, that all native documents had perished in the Saxon troubles. And as the water cannot rise above the fountain-head, so the silence of Eusebius, when we look to his own words, cuts away the ground altogether from his copyist's mistaken amplification of them.

But if general statements thus fail those who would ante-date British Christianity, still less can they rely upon circumstantial legends respecting individuals. We can scarcely hope, indeed, to lay the ghosts that have so long troubled the minds and disturbed the imaginations of patriotic and controversial historians; yet an attempt at really sifting evidence may effect something for truth in the present critical days. During the first two centuries of the Christian era, then,—1. Apostles, or apostolic men, are represented as preaching in Britain, and specially S. Paul. 2. British Christians are spoken of as in Britain itself. And, 3. either in Rome, or at different places in Gaul, or even Italy, conjecture, or mistake, or legend, has localized Christian Britons. We would fain hope, in spite of symptoms to the contrary, that the historical spirit has been so far cultivated among us, as at least to allay the storm of indignant moral reprobation which the denial of each and all of these stories is too likely to conjure up.

1. A patriarch of Jerusalem, in the year 629, Sophronius,

brings S. Paul to the shores of Britain. There is literally no earlier real authority for the story. A poet, Venantius Fortunatus, about 580, alleges that the Apostle's *pen* came thither, not himself;¹ evidence which would prove S. Cyprian, also, to have been a British missionary, for his pen, likewise, according to another Christian poet,² 'Gallos fovet, imbuit Britannos.' The vague rhetoric of Theodoret (in one passage of his writings) and of Eusebius, of whom one specifies the Apostle, but not the country, and the other names the country, but not the Apostle—a second passage, in which Theodoret speaks of S. Paul preaching in certain islands in the sea, meaning obviously Crete—the purely rhetorical verbiage of S. Jerome and S. Basil—prove simply nothing. And the well-known phrase of S. Clement, read by the light of S. Paul's expressed intention of journeying to Spain, would never have been quoted to prove a visit to Britain, except in the interest of a foregone conclusion. Those who maintain such a visit must, of course, find room for it in their chronology of S. Paul's life. To ourselves, who believe that there is simply no evidence for the story, it is superfluous to enter into chronological difficulties. Neither need we stop to argue its improbability upon other grounds; as, for instance, the absence of any traces of S. Paul's presence in the intervening Churches of Gaul, where in truth none existed for a full century after the supposed journey. The story must first of all have feet to stand upon, before it can be needful to waste time in knocking it down.

The visits of other Apostles to our shores (and there are no less than six, including S. Paul, for whom a claim has been put in) are equally destitute of any real ground to rest upon. The best authorities for them are such writings as the spurious *Synopsis Dorothei*, where we find, by way of measure of its historical value, one 'Cæsar, Bishop of Dyrrachium,' included among the 'seventy-two disciples,' on the authority of S. Paul, in Philipp. iv. 22; or the veracious Simeon Metaphrastes, or the Greek Menologies; sufficiently heavy weights, in point both of date and of internal credibility, to drown any statement respecting the early times we are now considering, to which their names alone are attached. A like fatal interval between the alleged fact, and the date of the witness, destroys the possibility of accepting Aristobulus, Celticized into Arwystli, as among the apostles of Wales. The authorities are the so-called Dorotheus above mentioned (and we have seen what that book is worth) and the Triads; the latter, by the very locality which they assign to him, as well as upon other grounds, belonging of necessity to a period considerably after Britons had become

¹ So Lingard.² Prudentius.

Welshmen, in the modern sense of the name, and, therefore, at the very least, four centuries and a half after date, and probably two or three centuries later still. We trust Mr. Morgan will forgive us, if we leave him, undisturbed by obtrusive argument, to his pleasant dream about Joseph of Arimathæa.

2. But what of that first of Christian kings, Lucius, or Lles, or Lleurwg, or Lleuer mawr, the premier patron of an Established Church, the great transformer of Flamens and Archflamens into Bishops and Archbishops, the prototype of the genuine Erastian form of regal supremacy, or, on the other side of the question, the correspondent and convert of the Pope, and the dutiful son of Rome? Shall we be forgiven, if, forced by the stern canons of evidence, we pronounce him a mere Roman invention of the fourth or fifth century, first dressed up into shape in Wales, in the eighth or ninth? The earliest traceable mention of such a personage is in the short biographies of the Popes, known as the *Catalogus Pontificum*. In the earliest form, indeed, of this *Catalogus*, coming down to 353, there is not a word on the subject. But in the next edition, so to call it, coming down to 527, one line is interpolated about it into the life of Pope Eleutherus, expressed in language so thoroughly of the mint of Roman writers of the beginning of the fifth century, as to betray its origin at once. Compare it, *e.g.* with Prosper's account, about the same date, of the missions by the Popes of Germanus and of Palladius, to England and Ireland respectively. And the peculiar phraseology employed enables us to trace the course of the story, as well as its birthplace. Bede first of all, learning it probably from his ordinary sources of Roman information, introduced it into England; his usual authority for British Church history, Gildas, being ignorant of the tale altogether. About a century or so afterwards, the so-called Nennius blunderingly repeats it—the first native authority that does so, unless the Triads preceded him, as possibly (accepting Mr. Stephens' verdict) the earliest of them may precede him by a few years. Thenceforward, legend is busy with the hitherto bare statement. And in the *Liber Landavensis*, and in the monkish stories with which William of Malmesbury adorned his 'Glastonbury Antiquities,' and still more in the vivacious pages of Geoffrey of Monmouth, it comes out at length in full bloom. It yet remained for a later and, if possible, clumsier forger to concoct the letter of Pope Eleutherus, and to thrust it, of all the odd places in the world (among, however, other purely legendary matter relating to Wales and its connexion with Saxon neighbours), into a kind of Appendix to the Laws of Edward the Confessor. Yet the impudence of the fiction finds really a shadow of excuse in the credulity which, even in this present year wherein we are writing, repeats the

myth of King Lucius' butler, and at least appears to believe as possible the veracity of the brass tablet, which, before the Great Fire, chronicled the hoar antiquity of S. Peter's, Cornhill. We need not go on to consider whether it be best, with Stillingfleet, to localize our imaginary king in wild and un-Romanized Sussex, or with most authors, agreeing with Welsh legends, in Glamorganshire, or with some romance writers of our own time, in Gloucester. Time enough, too, to adduce the analogies of Herod and Mithridates, or, nearer home, of Cogidunus, and other tributary kings, allowed to cling under the shadow of Rome to a precarious independence, when it is first shown that there is a tittle of reason for believing that our particular British tributary ever existed at all. Assuredly a fancy, or a blunder, or a fiction, picked up at Rome sometime during the fifth century, and translated into the language which seemed to a Roman biographer of Popes to be appropriate to his own ecclesiastical views, is not evidence on which to ground an historical statement, relating to an event in remote Britain, dated three centuries and a half before.

Of yet earlier candidates for the prerogative of premier Christian of Britain, such as Bran the Blessed and his family, we are equally constrained to pronounce a verdict of not proven. Traditions of the sixth or seventh centuries at the earliest, and probably of later date still (we refer ourselves to Mr. Stephens for the assertion), cannot establish as historical facts family histories of from five to six hundred years previous. It cannot, indeed, be pronounced impossible, that there could have been an isolated British Christian in the first century. We simply say, that there is no proof of the existence of such a one, while there is ample probability of the origination of fictions of the kind during the centuries from the fifth forwards, so prolific, among the Welsh, of ecclesiastical, as indeed also of other legend.

3. Turning our eyes across the Channel to continental and Southern Europe, we are met first of all by a family tale so touching, that it is cruel to disenchant the inventor from his dream by the cold chill of criticism. The family of Pudens and of Claudia, the Roman noble and the British princess, united in their grand Roman palace by the ties both of earthly marriage and of spiritual brotherhood,—their sons and daughters by name and history, each in turn martyrs for the faith,—their very parish church by name, and their parish clergyman by name, all complete—opening their hospitable doors to S. Paul, and forming a starting point for his mission to the lady's native land,—pity that so fair a tale should lack the one element necessary to convert a romance into a history. We turn to facts, and certainly a Pudens and a Claudia are coupled by S. Paul, and

a Pudens and a British lady Claudia are at a later date coupled together as husband and wife by Martial in certain epigrams; and though a less interval by a couple of generations would have made the identification easier, it is yet possible, by help of various suppositions, that the two pairs may be one and the same. It is true, further, that Pompina Græcina, the wife of an ex-governor of Britain, was accused and acquitted, A.D. 57 (Tac. A. xiii. 32), of a '*peregrina superstitio*,' which there is nothing to hinder, and nothing to prove, to have been Christianity; and that her husband, who had something to do with the Rufi, seems possibly to have borne some distant relationship to Claudia Rufina. It is true, also, that an inscription found at Chichester records the donation of the site of a heathen temple by the son of one Pudentinus, four letters alone of the donor's own name remaining, viz. 'ente,' conjectured by antiquarians, e.g. Horsley, to stand for Pudente; and that Cogidunus, the British prince, who assumed in honour of the emperor the name of Claudius, and is therefore supposed to have something to do with Claudia, occurs in the inscription also, as the dedicator of the temple. So far, we stand upon a few fragmentary facts. The connecting of these facts together, and the building out of them of a single story, is simply guess or legend—the unauthorized conversion of what physically might have been, into what actually has been, or the downright invention of a credulous age. Later martyrologies, in which the strangest blunders are mixed up with uncertified stories, form the sole direct testimony to any part of it.

But if classical writers yield a scanty return to our search, there is an abundant harvest derivable from untrustworthy compilers of the sixteenth century, if quantity could compensate for worthless quality. Unfortunately the four or five Britons traditionally claimed as founders, or bishops, of as many continental cloisters or churches in the first or second centuries, whom the omniscient diligence of Ussher has raked together—Beatus, the founder of Unterseven, on the Lake of Thun, Mansuetus, Bishop of Toul, Marcellus, first Bishop of Tongres and then of Trèves, Cataldus, the founder of Tarentine Christianity—to whom we may add Mello, Bishop of Rouen in the third century—rest upon no reliable authority; are in the first four instances dated at a time long preceding the possible existence of Christianity at all at the places assigned; and are, in a word, so entirely imaginary, that we should not have mentioned them, had not Mr. Morgan raised upon the assumption of their reality, one of his airy and pretentious superstructures of so-called history. Mello, too, the one among such shadowy possibilities who has the best evidence for his existence, is precisely the one about whom Mr. Morgan says nothing.

Sweeping away then the whole of the confused heap of legends which have thus overgrown the true history, we are limited by the scanty existing evidence to the end of the second century as the earliest date of a British Church at all. A few lines, to fill in the picture, and render it a little, though not much, more than a bare skeleton, are all that the remaining fragments of evidence will allow.

I. First, it seems to be undeniable, that the British Christians, until towards the departure of the Romans, were to be found in Roman settlements, and were drawn from Roman settlers, or from the population connected with them. There are only scanty traces of Celtic Christians, and none at all (of a trustworthy sort) of a Celtic Church beyond the Roman limits, until the close of that period. The British bishoprics, when named (as in 314), belong to the capitals of the Roman provinces: to York and London certainly, and almost certainly, also, to Caerleon—*Colonia Legionensium*.¹ British martyrs, so far as the accounts are trustworthy, belong to the same Caerleon and to Verulamium; and their names, Albanus, Julius, Aaron, are certainly not Celtic. The few other names preserved, however, include some of Celtic nationality, as Eborius, for instance, the somewhat suspicious name assigned to the Bishop of York in 314. Of his colleagues on that occasion, Restitutus and Adelfius, the latter may possibly be identical with Cadfrawd, as Rees supposes ('Welsh Saints'), just as Pelagius is supposed to be a translation of Morgan. But other and common Greek names occur in the Martyrologies, e.g. Socrates; and are just those we should expect to meet with, if the Christian ranks were recruited most largely (as is probable) from Roman slaves and freedmen. Celtic names, indeed, occur, mixed with Latin ones, on Cornish tombstones; but these are mostly of a date when the British Church had become undoubtedly the Church of the native Britons. It is a much stronger fact than the scanty evidence of a few names, that we find all the antiquarian remains of British Christianity, as the churches or crosses, for instance, at Canterbury, Dover, Richborough, Lyminge, Porchester, connected distinctly and exclusively with Roman stations, and almost wholly clustered in the original Roman corner of the country.² It is to be noticed, also, that Lappenberg has been misled by Ussher into his assertion of the existence of British translations of the Bible. There is no evidence for such translations in the alleged passage of S.

¹ *Colonia Londinensium*, as the original text now stands, is not seemingly more different from *Col. Legionensium*, than from *Col. Lind.*, or *Lindicolinum*, i.e. Lincoln; and the external evidence, from the unbroken tradition which names Caerleon, the capital of the then third Roman province, as the third British archiepiscopal see, in conjunction with York and London, seems conclusive for Caerleon.

² The few other existing remains are connected with Roman localities.

Chrysostom.¹ And a Latin translation, in many parts peculiar to Britain, was current in the time of Gildas. We assume, then, the original British Church to have been distinctly connected with Roman domination in Britain; and in estimating the importance of this fact, we must remember, upon the undeniable evidence of language, how little real hold Roman occupation had upon Britain, and in what comparatively scanty numbers Roman occupants settled or sojourned there.

II. And the British Church, accordingly, at this period was plainly of limited extent and narrow means. Wherever Roman settlements in Britain lasted for any length of time, there Roman remains occur, and usually in no small abundance. It has been remarked long since, with surprise, that while heathen inscriptions, and altars, and statues, and tombs, occur by hundreds, traces of Christianity are of the rarest possible kind. Along the whole line of the great Roman Wall from the Tyne to the Solway, one altar, out of many hundreds of different kinds of heathen remains, has been supposed, and erroneously supposed, to be Christian. At Bath, the second great repertory of Roman antiquities, the question has not even been raised. At Cirencester, a couple of coins of two Christian emperors prove nothing. Putting aside Cornwall, where, among abundant Christian British remains of later date, there occur also a Christian tombstone or two, probably of Roman times; setting aside also Wales, where we believe there are no Christian antiquities of earlier date than the sixth century, unless a questionable Roman tombstone, half Pagan, half Christian, discovered lately at Caerleon, be allowed as an exception; we are reduced to the remains of the churches above-mentioned,² to a pair of dubious mosaics—at Horkstow, in Lincolnshire, and Frampton, in Dorsetshire—Pagan far more than Christian, to an inscription on a tombstone now in Lincoln, which also was originally Pagan, and to a few miscellaneous articles found in Yorkshire and Northumberland. The existence of any of such remains is enough to disprove Mr. Wright's universal negative. The existence of so few is enough to prove conclusively, that the Church of Britain in Roman times was not the Church of the rich or the noble, or even the Church of the people, but was

¹ He speaks of Britons not as reading the Scriptures themselves, but as discoursing upon their contents—*τὰ ἀπὸ τῆς Γραφῆς φιλοσοφούντων*—in their native tongue.

² With respect to British churches, the frail and transitory nature of their material should be borne in mind. Those of which any remains are preserved to the present time, were of Roman building. The stone church of Candida Casa, and the other of Paulinus, at Lincoln, and the glass, and lead, and architectural ornaments of Wilfrid, were a double step in advance of the original British buildings. The wooden edifices of the later British and first Saxon churches were durable, compared to the wattle and mud walls of their first edifices.

scanty in numbers and poor in wealth. The acceptance of the imperial allowance, at Ariminum, by three British bishops alone, out of the entire body assembled, points to a like conclusion. Nor need we stop to notice the alleged multitude of British martyrs in the Diocletian persecution, when the real question on the evidence is, whether that persecution affected Britain at all.

III. If we turn from its secular to its ecclesiastical position, this poor and feeble, and not yet naturalized, Church, appears in history as simply following the lead of the Western Church in general, and specially of the Gallic. The Gospel, in the first instance, appears to have come in contact here (we are sorry to differ *toto cælo* from Mr. Morgan's Druidical dreams) with no special school of philosophy, with no profound or intelligent faith external to itself, and introducing new ideas into the Christian mind, with no great mental powers of any kind. Under the term of 'the Gauls,' we find Britain sometimes politically included with its opposite neighbours; and ecclesiastical ideas of its importance seem to have followed a similar line. Setting aside altogether the Arianism imputed to the Church of Britain by Gildas, as supported by no other evidence (as usual) than a misapplication of Eusebius, while it is conclusively negated by express testimonies of S. Athanasius, S. Chrysostom, Jerome, Sozomen, down to the synodical letter of the Council of Aquileia in 381,—we find British bishops silently counting as units in all the acts and fortunes of the Western Church; assenting to the Paschal among the other decrees of the Council of Arles in 314; assenting expressly (though probably not present) to both the faith and the Paschal decree of the Council of Nice; joining in the acquittal of S. Athanasius, at Sardica, in 347; ranked as orthodox, in 358, by S. Hilary of Poitiers, whose devoted admirers they were, in common with their Gallic neighbours; yet hesitating for a time, with the rest of the unmetaphysical Westerns, over the term *ὁμοούσιον*; beguiled into unintentional Arianism, perhaps at the Council of Milan in 355, but certainly at that of Ariminum in 359; yet unhesitatingly adhering again to S. Athanasius and to orthodoxy in 362. We would gladly believe them to have been at Nice, were it probable. But although the existing lists are corrupt, and therefore not conclusive, yet the universality of Constantine's invitation, extending, according to Eusebius, to all bishops everywhere, is obviously too weak a premiss to prove the actual presence of the bishops of a particular country, even though that country be one in which Constantine had a special interest; especially as Eusebius, in the same passage, evidently contemplates Gaul, not Britain, as forming with Persia the Dan and Beersheba respectively of

the Churches of the time. While Gelasius of Cyzicum raises a strong counter-presumption, if he can be trusted, by telling us that, whereas copies of the Nicene decree were carried usually to their respective countries by the bishops of those countries, the copies for Britain, among the other Western Churches, were borne by Vitus and Vincent, the Roman presbyters, under the direction of Hosius. The like undistinguished course continues onward into the fifth century. The very mention of Britons usually arises from the geographical or rhetorical motive of singling out one of the extremest limits of the Church. And thence alone it is, that we find them specified, for instance, in S. Jerome, or Palladius, or Theodoret, as meeting their ecclesiastical antipodes, the Persians, not at Rome only, but at the then common centre of Christian patriotism, at Jerusalem—visiting the holy places, sharing with others the hospitalities there dispensed by the bounteous Lady Melania, or gazing with awe, as they traversed the neighbouring Syria, upon Simeon on his lofty pillar.

The evident dependence of the early British upon the Gallic Church, leads to a like conclusion respecting the original insignificance of the former, and its lack of individual character. That dependence is evidenced in many ways. The leading Gallic bishops, from the beginning of the fourth to the middle of the fifth century, Hilary of Poitiers, Martin of Tours, Germain of Auxerre, successively sway the British Church as absolutely as their own. We have seen how Britain looked to S. Hilary's guidance in Arian times. In the Pelagian controversy they had the like recourse to Germain and his brother bishops, Lupus and Severus. And the dedication to S. Martin of churches at Canterbury and at Whitherne,¹ the only two known British dedications of Roman date, and the express testimony of Venantius Fortunatus, and the watching of S. Columbanus for five nights, and afterwards of S. Senanus, at the tomb of S. Martin, and the keeping of S. Martin's *Dies Natalis* in Ireland, and numberless other facts of a like kind, which may be found in Dr. O'Connor's pages, prove how enduring and deep the feeling was with respect to him. The mission of S. Keby to Wales by Hilary, that of Ninian to Whitherne, and of S. Patrick to Ireland, in connexion with S. Martin, show that even British missionary zeal, up to the fifth century, needed to be kindled and instructed from Gallic sources. And to this must

¹ The numerous dedications to S. Martin of existing English churches—there is a S. Martin's church in every one of the older cathedral towns in England south of (and inclusive of) York, if we except Rochester, and accept Leicester in lieu of Lichfield, besides very many others, from S. Martin's Isle among the islands of Scilly, to Martindale in Westmoreland—are of course, at the earliest, of Saxon origin.

be added the fact, that the erroneous Easter cycle of the subsequent British Churches was precisely the cycle of the Gallic Sulpicius Severus, drawn up about 410, and retained by them in the isolation which shortly afterwards cut them off from Southern Europe, while Rome gradually amended her own cycle from time to time, beginning with Victor of Aquitaine, about 457, in order to bring it into harmony with that of Alexandria. The Gallic psalter, again, was that used in Ireland, as Ussher tells us, on evidence drawn from Sedulius, a writer of the end of the fifth century; although, on the other hand, it is evident, from Gildas, that the Roman psalter was current in Britain some half-century later. That the British liturgy was borrowed from the Gallic, is simply an inference, although a probable one, from the connexion between the Churches, and cannot therefore be alleged in proof of that connexion; while the peculiar customs common to both, which are commonly alleged (the anointing of the *hands* of presbyters, for instance, at their ordination, mentioned by Gildas), appear rather to have been borrowed by the Gallic, through the Saxon, from the British liturgy itself, at a much later period. But the fact needs no aid from doubtful sources. If anything is certain of the older British Church, it is its relation of dependence on the leadership of that of Gaul.

IV. The revolution wrought in the British Churches in the fifth and sixth centuries is palpable. Its nature and its cause afford the only ground for dispute. One might assume the probability of an extension of the Gospel to the native population by the fifth century. It is certain that the British Church was that of the nation in the sixth. The impossibility of tracing any bishopric in England at all, except the two at London and York, or any Welsh bishopric except Caerleon, to an earlier date than the first half of the sixth century, and the complete identification of all British ecclesiastical tradition with Wales exclusively, save in the two cases where Saxon Christianity preserved or restored it, viz. Glastonbury and S. Alban's, fall in with other evidence to prove, that the identification of the Christian Church with the nation dated but a short time before the period of Saxon inroads. On the other hand the language of Gildas is a full proof of that Church's nationality in the midst of this period. During the generation or two preceding that historian (so to call him), *i.e.* at the close of the fifth and beginning of the sixth century, the Church of Britain manifestly had become Celtic in its character, and pretty well coextensive with at least a large portion of the island south of Tweed. And the language of Constantius in his *Life of Germanus* carries up both statements to the yet earlier date of the beginning of the fifth

century, while Saxons were as yet merely foreign robbers and not settled in the land. Its extension to Ireland and Scotland, the introduction and wide spread of monachism within it, its reputation for learning, its band of saints, the foundations, in a word, of its subsequent greatness, date roughly from the same period. And if the existence of controversy and the conflicts of the truth with heresy are a proof of life, that proof also is to be found in the tenacity with which Pelagianism, although Britain was not its birthplace, nor a Briton its originator,¹ yet clung to these islands after it had been crushed elsewhere. The disputed question is, whence this change arose. Was it the result of an Eastern connexion, original or subsequent? or of Druidism? or simply of the natural growth of a Church, thrown upon its own resources, purified by suffering, vitalized by its own missionary efforts, marked indeed (as time went on) by peculiarities arising from isolation, but otherwise deriving strength and character from having become the Church of a wide-spread race, which was destined, it is true, to succumb before the more practical sturdiness of the Teuton, but was full, nevertheless, of a vigorous and characteristic life of its own? We have no hesitation in closing with this last supposition. That Druidism coloured the later Welsh Christianity, is both probable, and is indeed shown by such semi-pagan productions as Taliessin's to have been the fact. And it is quite possible that the Pelagian doctrines may have derived some additional strength from kindred Druidical tenets. On the other hand, it is very hard to say, how much of what passes for Druidism, was really borrowed and distorted from Christianity itself. As one element, however, in Celtic belief, we have no desire to dispute the possible truth of Mr. Morgan's assertion of its influence upon the British Church. All we affirm is, that, except in a few fragments of semi-pagan Welsh poetry, and perhaps in its possible affinity to Pelagianism, such influence is untraceable. The Eastern theory boasts of more and greater names in its support. Yet no theory ever was more baseless. In one sense, indeed, every Church in the world is Eastern. Even in a more precise sense, the Western Churches, including Rome, were Eastern. They were in the first instance Greek in character and speech, and two centuries at least elapsed, before 'the Latin tongue became Christian.' It is true also that the Church of Lyons, to which geographical considerations attach the probable origin of that of these islands, derived its origin

¹ Pelagianism found, no doubt, a heresiarch and a name in a British monk, and that heresiarch a coadjutor (probably) in an Irishman. But neither Pelagius nor Celestius originated the heresy. It was imparted to Pelagius by Rufinus, a Syrian, and not in Britain, but in Rome.

from an Eastern source different from that equally Eastern source whence was derived the Church of Rome. But the British Eastern theory, if it means anything, means that the British Church stands distinguished from all other Western Churches by some peculiar and independent Eastern origin—connected with Jerusalem by some, by others with more shadow of reason with Asia Minor and S. John,—sufficient to account for alleged peculiarities in that British Church itself. It rests upon no ancient evidence.¹ It is simply a modern conjecture. It is a theory devised to account for those peculiarities. And if every one of these turns out to be the product of home-growth, and to be widely different from the ways of any Eastern Church whatever, the theory falls to the ground at once. Now such is undoubtedly the case. The British Easter cycle is the main support assumed for the theory. That Easter cycle, if we look to the facts, simply followed the cycle employed by the Western Church, and specially by the Church of Rome, even in its errors, up to the beginning of the fifth century, and then remained stationary in the erroneous form which Rome had at that time adopted, while Rome herself learned better things and accommodated herself gradually to the greater astronomical wisdom of Alexandria. It is a proof, then, of connexion with Rome, not of the contrary. And it agreed neither with the Quartodeciman view of the earlier Asiatics of Asia Minor, nor with the Alexandrine rule which governed the Eastern Church in general after the Council of Nice. The British mode of tonsure, which is a second point, leads to a precisely similar conclusion. It was as different from the Eastern as it was from the Roman tonsure, and obviously grew up among the Celtic Christians without any copying of other Churches, Eastern or Western. The Eastern tonsure, indeed, never came to British shores at all. And if S. Patrick did really introduce the Roman fashion into Ireland, it was, at all events, speedily supplanted by the Irish. The peculiar and independent monastic rule of Columbanus was equally of home growth, so far as any monastic rule was so in the West. Monastic institutions altogether were originally from the East; and Eastern rules were introduced into the West; and S. Basil's rule, which some have fancied the source of that of Columbanus, penetrated, among numberless others, into Gaul, and as far north as, *e.g.* Limoges, although in conjunction there with the rule of

¹ Bishop Colman, of Whitby, in 664, did not claim an Eastern origin for the Scotch or British Church. He merely asserted, and that incorrectly, that the Scotch kept Easter in the same way as S. John had done. Macpherson is the earliest writer in whom we at this moment remember to have noticed the conjecture. It is put forward by him as a conjecture, and upon the ground of the usual blunder about the British Easter.

Cassian, and was common enough in Italy, we are told, after its appearance in a Latin translation. Up to the time of Benedict, there was, in fact, a multiplicity of rules in Western monachism, mainly derived from Eastern sources, but modified by Western founders of monasteries. The Scotch or Irish rule, or rules, may well have been drawn, as were those of Gaul, from Eastern sources, in combination with Western alterations; as, indeed, is expressly asserted of the rule introduced by S. Patrick into Ireland. But there is not a shadow of evidence for any connexion with the East in the matter, peculiar to Britain or to Ireland. Pelagianism, again, has been connected, even by such an historian as Neander, with this alleged Eastern character of British Christendom. Yet surely Pelagianism was distinctly the heresy of the practical common sense of the Western Church, as much as the metaphysical and unpractical subtleties of Arianism belonged to the Eastern. The præ-Augustine and Eastern fathers Pelagianized, if they did so, only as writers might who wrote before the question was broached. The Western Church, and that alone, embraced and retained and was divided by the heresy, as by one akin to its habits of thought. The Greek crosses found in Cornwall,¹ may be accounted for by the general intercourse of the Church as a whole. And distinctive British peculiarities of ritual are so vaguely known, as to afford no ground for saying more than that, at any rate, nothing peculiarly Eastern appears in them.² But if the ground thus breaks away from all the alleged proofs of this Eastern origin—*cadit questio*—there is no more need of argument to disprove that origin. The theory was invented to account for the facts; and if the facts not only do not harmonize, but hopelessly disagree with it, there is an end of the matter. We will only add, in conclusion, that the independent position occupied by the British Churches with respect to Rome, and maintained by them when Rome had advanced her pretensions, and strove to interfere with it, presents a much stronger argument against the Papal supremacy, if held to proceed from a Church simply Western, and differing in no way in point of origin from the Gallic Church or the Spanish, than if, in order to its validity, we deem it necessary to characterise the claimant of it as a Church of another order, and springing from an independent source.

¹ That found in 1829, in S. Cuthbert's grave at Durham, was *not* there when the tomb was opened in 1104, and is conjectured by Lingard to have been placed there for safety at the time of the Reformation.

² We do not know on what authority Döllinger affirms the British Church to have used unleavened wafers at the Eucharist, while the Church of Rome used leavened bread.

No. X.—*The English Cathedral of the Nineteenth Century.*
By A. J. B. BERESFORD HOPE, M.A. D.C.L. With Illustrations. London: John Murray, Albemarle Street. 1861.

It has been said that many of our best and even standard works have owned an occasional and accidental origin. Their authors did not, after the German fashion, sit down of a set purpose and with premeditated malice to write a formal and systematic treatise. Some local controversy, some chance occasion, some incident or accident of the day, stirred the writer's mind, and perhaps what is in fact, and for all practical purposes, an exhaustion of a single subject is the result. Especially has this peculiarity of our literature been observed in the later English theology. A threatened conversion or perversion of a single and not remarkable woman, set Laud to write on what at last came out as a complete work against the claims of Rome, though it still bears the oral form of the original dialogue. Hooker's masterpiece grew out of a very small purpose. Almost all Bull's works were occasioned by small circumstances. Wall's volumes grew out of a personal dispute. The book before us resembles in this respect of its *genesis* many books with which it would be an honour to compare any production of a living pen. From a letter in a newspaper and a lecture delivered before a local Society, has grown Mr. Beresford Hope's volume, which, as far as its title promises, may be said to be complete. There is something satisfactory in a volume of this informal character, and the reader seems to be present as at some process of nature. There is the germ gradually developing its organs and accessories: there is the island slowly rising from its nucleus of rock or coral, and gradually clothed with vegetation: there is the molecule stage by stage rising into higher organization. A book in which you can trace the natural developments of this sort has a natural aspect. It predisposes the reader in its favour. Mr. Beresford Hope is a natural writer. His first thought can be traced, a solid unity: and round it is a natural accretion of subjects fairly growing out of it. His subject is the English Cathedral of the Nineteenth Century, and he is led to examine it in its two aspects, the material cathedral and the moral cathedral.

At first sight there seems to be here not so much a comparison of terms as an ambiguity. But the same may be said of the term Church, which the systematic writers treat under its double aspect, *Ecclesia in sensu morali*, and *Ecclesia in sensu*

materiali. Our American cousins, with an affectation of precision, have avoided what they consider an ambiguity by inventing the ugly term 'Church edifice' for the material Church. The germs of Mr. Beresford Hope's double treatment may be found in the two primary documents out of which his book was moulded. The moral or social or political use of a cathedral he treated first of all in a very able and comprehensive letter which he printed in the *Times* newspaper in December, 1857, under the popular title of 'The Work of the Church among the Millions,' reprinted at p. 6 in the present volume: and the sketch of an ideal English Cathedral in its material aspect he elaborated in a lecture delivered last year before the Cambridge Architectural Society. These two documents are the foundation of the present work, which treats the cathedral as a building and an institution. In this notice we shall follow this division.

Mr. Beresford Hope has earned the right to instruct us on this subject under either of its aspects. Skilled above the ordinary accomplishments of an amateur in architecture, the present author has added to an inherited taste a vast amount of information patiently gathered and luminously surveyed in practical art. But Mr. Beresford Hope is no *dilettanti* student. He has shown by a life of service to the Church of England, that he is not a mere æsthetic and pedantic art-critic. He has not worked at architecture as men do in entomology or botany. He values the material Church but for its spiritual significance and practical use. In his life and works he has earned a title to discuss subjects of this grave importance. He knows quite as much of Church work, Church necessities, and Church grievances, as he does about middle pointed and French pointed. His book is concerned with Church extension in either sense of the term; and his eye is as keen to detect a blunder in administration, as a solecism in mouldings or tracery.

To express summarily his view on the adaptation of Church work to large towns, his thesis is, that a large church, with a staff of associated workers, is the better method than the planting of little independent benefices by the sub-division of parishes. He is perhaps somewhat reticent and chary in announcing this view in all its boldness; but this is what he means. The form in which he finds this more practical organization for town missions is in the cathedral. Of course we are thankful for the inquiry in this form; but it seems to be somewhat a forced and strained necessity to connect this subject with the cathedral only. A cathedral is not necessarily a large church; nor by the force of terms does it imply any Church work at all. A Dean and Chapter, or Canons, or associated

clergy, are not necessary to a cathedral; and we could have all the work done which Mr. Beresford Hope wants done, without a cathedral at all. In other words, a cathedral need not be a large church; and a large church, and large work, frequent and solemn services, and a body of working clergy, does not necessitate a cathedral. A cathedral is merely the church in which the bishop's house or cathedra or a little chapel is fixed. This may be a wooden hut, or a canvass tabernacle; and a centre of missionary work may be in a town which is not a city. As a mere matter of history, Mr. Beresford Hope is right in tracing the evangelization of a country from certain defined episcopal centres, each of which implied of course a cathedral, because a bishop must set up his throne somewhere; and he is correct in observing that these episcopal centres threw out parochial divisions, and the scattering, as it were, of independent parish priests. But a cathedral can only effect what our author requires to be done when it is also a collegiate or chapter church, and the collegiate church is not necessarily an institution in any sense to be identified with a cathedral. A collegiate church is in fact what Mr. Beresford Hope requires, though for convenience sake he treats it under the common term cathedral. We do not by any mean intends to say that this distinction has not been present to the writer's mind. But his title hardly does justice to the fulness of his materials. The book contains much more than it promises; it not only says, as the late Lord Herbert said in a valuable pamphlet, how existing cathedral institutions may be utilized, but what is the especial way of dealing with the want of the times. This is shown by the origin of the letter to the *Times*. It was occasioned by the opening of Westminster Abbey, followed by that of the Cathedral of London, for what are called special services. These special services were the answer which churchmen made to the taunt that so many thousands followed Mr. Spurgeon; and were the alternative offered by the existing system to the Exeter Hall services, to which Mr. Edouart offered a well-meant but technical resistance.

At this point and crisis Mr. Beresford Hope writes his letter to the *Times*. It is a very characteristic and able one. Mr. Beresford Hope's mind is a political one, and his parliamentary training has taught him that art, so difficult for very earnest persons like himself to acquire, what not to say as well as what to say. He had a difficult work before him in his letter, which was not only to discredit the Spurgeon mania, not only to say but little in favour of the Westminster Abbey services, then in the first flush of their popularity; but, with an eye to conciliate the readers of the *Times*, to say what he could even for Lord

Shaftesbury and the Exeter Hall committee. We must congratulate so good and tried a churchman on his success in this delicate task. What he says in substance is, that the desire to hear great preachers was not an unnatural thing, or one to be disregarded; that the desire shown by the originators of the Exeter Hall services to bring religion 'home to the masses,' was in itself a most commendable thing; but that it was not fair to leave such a work to the desultory energies of an accidental committee. That the Church itself was the best committee, and the diocesan and cathedral idea the natural centre, from which extensive operations, such as great town missions, including special services, should be derived. That the proper constitution of the Church was a balance of the cathedral and parochial systems. That the strict incisive theory of the parochial system would be sure to break down, as it had broken down, in large towns, and that instead of attempting to go on with the subdivision of parishes, it would be better to think of a co-operative agency and a consolidated mission and associated clergy. Not that all of this was said by Mr. Beresford Hope in his letter; nor is every word of it to be found in his published volume. But here is an extract which may be taken as a favourable specimen of his matter and manner:—

'When we consider the condition of spiritual destitution to which the combined action of a rapidly increasing population and an unelastic law of parochial subdivision and endowment had reduced England at the commencement of the century, and compare it with the activity which characterises, in various measures, almost every part of the Church at the present day, we can only exclaim, "It is the Lord's doing, and it is marvellous in our eyes." But it would be a foolish and hurtful optimism to suppose that the actual system was the complete panacea for all the spiritual wants of the nation. Excellent as the parochial system is in so many ways, it yet must tend, if unmodified by other agencies, to a disjunctive and separatist, rather than a co-operative and harmonising order of things. The church with its incumbent, the school with its teacher, are admirable, each in its own sphere; but if neither of them is to be drawn upwards in itself, nor towards its own similarly-placed neighbour, by the proximity of some more exalted exemplar, each will be apt to trail upon the ground within a limited circle. If there is no harmonising principle at work to blend the local idiosyncrasies of each little centre, every such small community will be apt to become a law to itself in defiance of its neighbours, or else to lose heart and energy from the absence of that encouragement which a superior and regulating organisation can alone afford. I need no further proof of my position than the practical working of that well-known measure of ecclesiastical reform, Sir Robert Peel's Act. This act was passed to remedy an order of things which called for legislation, and it has proved in many respects a blessing to the Church of England. Greater facilities were unquestionably needed for the subdivision of parishes than already existed, and these the act provided upon the broad and intelligible principle, then for the first time admitted into our Parliamentary legislation for ecclesiastical matters, that the creation of the cure of souls was of more importance than the completion of the material fabric, and that the new autonomy ought, therefore, to date from the endowment of the incumbent, and not from the building of the

ohurch. That Sir Robert Peel's Act has, however, proved an unmixed blessing, no man, unconnected with the Ecclesiastical Commission, would, I should think, be bold enough to asseverate. The week's contents of the waste-paper basket of any person supposed to be bountiful towards Church purposes, would give the most complete and pointed reply to such an assertion. There are, in truth, few more melancholy records of difficulty and privation, manfully, I believe, and Christianly borne up against as the general rule, than that interminable series of circulars, printed and lithographed, by incumbents of destitute Peel districts which are ever passing and re-passing through the post-office. The same story, with a few variations, runs through them all. The church is either unbuilt, and Divine Service performed in some wretched, pestilential, unsuitable hole, or else it has been built with a debt which is breaking the backs of all who have taken part in that good work. Then comes in the regular reference to the church-rate, and we are either informed that the rate has been refused for years past, as the new church stands in a populous place, or else it is levied for the benefit of the mother-church, and the new institution gets nothing at all, or much less than its right proportion. Then there is no school, or the school also is insolvent, while the incumbent finds himself reduced to that most painful and detrimental of acts—namely, to proclaim the personal indigence of a gentleman and often of a gentlewoman to the ears of strangers. In the meanwhile, the poverty-stricken district cannot be effectively worked, even in proportion to the means which it has scraped together. A morning spent in posting urgent appeals even in behalf of God's house, is a bad preparation for preaching God's word in that house. Besides, the single-handed clergyman is physically unable to work his natural resources to the uttermost. The best head and the best lungs must often flag, under the incessant physical fatigue of public ministrations in a populous district carried on without change or assistance. The clergyman soon discovers that his public services, drawn from a jaded and insufficient source, are becoming rapid and forced, and he feels that the attendance runs the risk of speedy diminution. If we add to this the wear and tear of home visiting and such ministrations, the toil of keeping up the schools, and the petty harassing details of clubs and other miscellaneous calls upon the clergyman's time and energy, we cannot hesitate to own that the underpaid and unassisted minister of a Peel district in a town, who tries to do his duty, stands in a false and impossible position, and that his success or failure is no criterion of the real strength of the Church of England if properly set in motion. The evil is increasing day by day; and if the religious world is not timely wise, there may some day be a terrible crash and collapse of character and influence, not to say a general catastrophe of material reverses. The Church is on its trial in more ways than one in the Peel parishes, for in no long time the authorities will find that it is impossible to persuade men of education and proved character, such as the ideal Church-of-England clergyman ought to be, to shipwreck fortune, health, and usefulness in whirlpools so obscure and so repulsive as the bankrupt districts; and the result must be that we shall find a body of clergymen without education or social standing foisted into the ministry as stopgaps for the destitute localities. I need not say how grievous a misfortune both to Church and State would be this deterioration of the clerical standard. The evil may perhaps take the form of there growing up two castes of clergymen: one will be the incumbents of vicarages and rectories, men of education, influence, and social standing, out of whom dignitaries will be ordinarily chosen—and the other will be the incumbents of district churches, "literate" who enter holy orders without a reasonable hope of any better material position, and all whose associations, social and professional, will tend to keep them apart, in an attitude of ignorant and dissatisfied hostility, both from the gentry and the university-bred incumbent of the old parishes. If this state of things should unhappily

come about, we shall see in England the repetition in our reformed community of that same disastrous and scandalous feud which afflicted the mediæval Church in the contest of the secular clergy alongside of the ancient monasteries with the newly-minted and democratic *Fratres*. Perhaps, however, an even worse evil may befall us, and the lean cattle devour the fat. The "literate" may become the typical incumbent of England, and that grand personage, the English clergyman—gentleman and scholar as well as Christian—become a thing of the past.

'I do not, of course, pretend to say that what has been done, even if somewhat amiss, can now be re-constituted on a better basis. Where three puny churches, each with a single ill-endowed clergyman, and a proportionately feeble tariff of services, have been erected in a locality where one large church with a staff of four or five clergy, and constant opportunities of worship at all hours, would have been infinitely more beneficial, and not have cost one farthing more at the onset, then these three churches must, I suppose, be still maintained as a vested interest. But at least we can be more wise for the future in the institutions which we raise up to meet the growing wants of an increasing population, and to palliate, if not remove, the inconveniences of the existing organization.'—Pp. 14—19.

Mr. Beresford Hope goes on to argue that the Cathedral system is the only remedy for this state of things, and he appears to adopt without qualification the recommendation of the Commissioners of 1851, in favour of a subdivision of the English dioceses. But the gravest difficulty of this plan is passed over *sicco pede*, not only by Mr. Beresford Hope but by the gentlemen who recently presented a memorial to Lord Palmerston on the subject. Theoretically no doubt there ought to be an increase of the Episcopate, proportionate to that of the population. But what about the appointment to the new sees? Would a multiplication of the Premier's type, the Palmerston Bishop, be a gain to any religious, social, or political interest? Is there any likelihood that the Government would allow a free election of Bishops? If not, would not cheap Bishops follow the cheap Clergymen whose portraits Mr. Beresford Hope so well draws? The answer to these doubts is to have faith in the divinely appointed order of Bishops. Certainly, nothing but faith in a Divine institution could enable a churchman to endure, say the Hoadlys of a past generation or the Prince-Bishops of another country; but we ought to have, and we have, faith in the divinely appointed order of the priesthood, and yet this faith cannot close our eyes to the evils contingent and actual of that remarkable order of clergy—the semi-socialist and starving incumbents of a poor church in a poor manufacturing town. Nor are we quite satisfied with the suggestion of reviving that odd institution, the diluted bishop, the chorepiscopus of the books. For what the chorepiscopus of fact was few people inquire.¹ Besides the

¹ 'Chorepiscopi non erant Episcopi, nec eorum ecclesiæ erant cathedrales: cap. *Ecclesiæ*, 3, dist. 68, ibi: 'Inter Episcopos verum et Chorepiscopos hæc

consideration that an inferior order of bishops would tell on the existing episcopate, we must bear in mind the caution of the old canons, which forbid the extreme multiplication of bishops, *ne vilescat episcopatus*. Mr. Beresford Hope says, that it is conceivable, but most condemnable, that the episcopate should be extended, as in America, without a corresponding expansion of the Cathedral system. We should be disposed to invert this observation, and to reply, that it is quite possible to have all those advantages of centralization, large churches, and frequent services, without any very considerable increase of the episcopate; which, without such guarantees as we are scarcely likely to gain, would be a very problematical benefit to the existing Church. Having arrived at this point, Mr. Hope connects the second part of his work—the material, with the moral element. The Cathedral system is the right centre of Town Mission. A cathedral is not necessarily a very large or expensive affair. Cathedrals have been recently built in the colonies, or projected for the colonies. Here, he adds, is a list of them: these were built to meet certain needs of the colonists, felt and recognised. Those needs are our own. Why should we not try a remedy which has been found useful elsewhere?

Our only difference with Mr. Beresford Hope is a verbal one; and we might say, that as all he wants might be done without the increase of the episcopate, and that a new cathedral cannot exist without a new see, all this portion of his work is practically a misnomer. The cathedral idea is not necessary to the fulfilment of his ideal: a collegiate church would be quite enough. But passing over this minute criticism, we are thankful that a layman so valued and trusted as Mr. Beresford Hope, has spoken, though so cautiously, and with such wise and respectful deference as he has done, on the great question of Church extension.

The late Bishop Blomfield, with characteristic energy and honesty, took up the problem, and tried to solve it, as he did every difficulty, by what he thought to be common sense. But in this, as in many other matters, commonplace sense is not common sense. The commonplace view of this Church extension is to consider it as an arithmetical sum. If 500 people in the country, or 2,000 people in a town, are enough for one parson to look after, there are given so many people, how many parsons

est differentia: quod Episcopi non nisi in Civitatibus, Chorepiscopi et in Vicis ordinari possunt: Episcopi formatas tribuunt literas, et Chorepiscopi non nisi commendatitias et pacificas dare valent: Episcopi jus consecrandi habent, Chorepiscopi tantum minores ordines tribuunt, Leviticam autem et Sacerdotalem benedictionem non valent præstare.' Ferraris, *Bibliothec. sub voc. Episcopus*. The Chorepiscopi had not the power to ordain, nor to consecrate churches, nor to confirm, nor to use the chrism, nor to reconcile penitents. The Chorepiscopi were, in fact, little more than rural deans.

do we want? If a town church holds 1,000 people, how many thousands are there in London without Church accommodation, and how many churches shall we want? This was Bishop Blomfield's method. This was what he approximately aimed at. But the very enunciation of such a problem condemned it. It was absolutely impossible to get either the men, the churches, or the money; and this the late Bishop of London lived to find out. But if he could not do everything, he could do something; if he could not build a brazen wall, he could stop a gap in the hedge here and there. So the Bethnal Green churches were built, and cheap churches were built about the suburbs; and something was done to overtake the daily increasing hordes of irreligion and vice. And at first some success was achieved. The first incumbents of these new churches were often men of energy, and sometimes of means; but that energy being but of flesh and blood, was not immortal; those means were not those of Fortunatus; and somehow, Bishop Blomfield could not face a failure. He complained of his tools when his principle was wrong. He did not always encourage men in difficult positions, though few sympathized so warmly with those who were, or who said they were, successful. And so the great scheme of Church extension in London languished, and before the death of the late Bishop, it may be said to have passed out of official hands into those of private energy. Here and there a splendid church has been erected by private munificence, but the Metropolis Churches' Fund died of absolute inanition before its exemplary and excellent founder. Bishop Blomfield lived to see the rise and extinction of parochial subdivision on the old scale, and according to the old idea. That idea was that of the infinite divisibility of matter. Dichotomies were to be dichotomized *ad infinitum*. But a moral problem cannot be solved by material methods of this sort. When, as among ourselves, the principle of private judgment, self-dependence, personal choice, or whatever else it is to be called, has got head, minds are not to be governed by an order in council. When the district churches are built, it is impossible in towns to force the parochial system. People will go to church where they choose, not where they ought to go according to the Church theory. But it was with the clergy of the new districts that the break-down was most complete. Some disdained the arts by which popularity was to be won: and some were incapable of attracting their parishioners either by life example or power; and when the late Bishop of London, by deserting those of his clergy who stuck by him on his charge of 1842, showed that it was the best policy to defy him as the Islington clergy did on that memorable occasion, he found some difficulty in manning his new churches, or at least

in getting successors to his first incumbents. And we mention London only, because it fairly represents the system of minute subdivision of parishes. The plan as long as it lasts is this: Get a young and enthusiastic clergyman; set him down single-handed to build schools, compel him to do the whole work of the church, and keep up all its institutions, its lectures and library and night schools: let him have a wife and family, which gives a respectable air to the institution, and a Peel district and 150*l.* per annum. And this may be done once. A curate is always found to take a new church. He generally has small means, great spirits, and good principles. In a few years he is used up: the orange is sucked, and goes the way of all sucked oranges. And if this were all, the consequences would be rather favourable than otherwise to the Church. As the blood of martyrs is a fertilizing shower to the Church, so a succession of used-up incumbents is not without its moral effects. After all, to be ruined in health and pocket in a Peel district is in itself a kind of confessorship; and as to mere suffering, the axe and the stake are not perhaps so hard to endure as the daily cross of accumulating debts and difficulties which at last submerge the poor Peel incumbent.

But the evil does not stop here. There is likely enough to arise another race of clergy, who are resolved not to spend and be spent after this tame and inglorious fashion. If from experience it has been found that the new churches and new parishes did not work well, perhaps the fault was in the men, not the system. Had we got hold of the right sort of men? This is the present cry, and we are to go on another tack. To deal with the masses—this, we believe, was the recognised formula—we should have men of the masses. The university man, with his refinement, and scholarship, and traditions, and social standing, is not fitted for this rough work. As diamond alone cuts diamond, so rough work must be done with rough tools. We want a cheap and rough-and-ready clergy. This is the last invention of the day,—the very newest form of ‘evangelizing the masses.’ As is the moral principle, so is its formal and material expression. The school church—half lecture-room, half preaching-hall, one-tenth a house of prayer, and nine-tenths made up of the place of assembly for the multiplication table and the rifle drill—is the fitting accompaniment of prayer and sacraments accommodated to the spirit of the times. This is what is coming of what is now the prevailing fashion. This new method contains half a truth. It is quite true that we want men more than churches, and we want an elastic system; quite true that parochial subdivision is not enough. The churches, if properly used for various services at various hours,

are not so insufficient after all. We do want men rather than churches.

Other evils of the district churches have not been slow to show themselves. The faults of these small independent churches, with needy incumbents outbidding each other in the religious market, and underselling each other in pews and schools, and, as was actually the case in one notorious instance, in a tariff of fees, are patent enough. So is the personal rivalry of neighbouring perpetual curates. But the evil does not stop even here; not only is the clerical *status*, but the clerical *morale* lowered. Premiums are held out to uneducated *alumni* of the cheap colleges to enter into holy orders, and all the evils of the Mendicant orders are introduced into the purer and reformed branch of the Church. It is a rise in the social scale for a linen-draper's clerk to become a reverend gentleman, and there will never be wanting candidates for the ministry if you lower the standard. But these recruits bring into the army of the Church not only the manners but the moral tone of the class which they represent. A socialist English clergy is no remote possibility. In the middle ages the Mendicants always headed the social *jacqueries*, and the brethren of the free spirit were popular favourites because they represented and encouraged the popular discontent with endowments, settled income, and landed inheritance. We deprecate the coming of that day, or the triumph of those principles, which shall encourage the rise of such an element in the clerical hierarchy of England. When clergymen clamour for the equalization of the poor rate, or take up the cause of the costermongers against the law, they forget that they are playing the game of socialism.

Undoubtedly Mr. Beresford Hope deserves thanks for touching, with however light and graceful a hand, these plague-spots in our system. There is only one difficulty which he has not met. He pleads forcibly for associated town missions, as against the system of small and independent, and desultory, and often hostile efforts. But he has scarcely taken into account the fact that, as regards England, the evil is not of recent growth. The great collegiate church has been always a comparative stranger in the quiet towns of this country. It is a historical fact that our cities, unlike those of the Continent, always abounded in small, independent churches and parishes. London, before the Fire, possessed separate churches and parishes in the closest proximity. Many of the old London churches were within fifty yards of each other. York, Norwich, Exeter, Bristol, Lincoln, exhibited the same facts. The English mind was always adverse to centralization; and the late Bishop of London, and Dean Hook, had at least the strong argument of precedent in their favour. In

Paris, or Lyons, or Antwerp, there was always the collegiate system at work; and their few vast churches, with an ample body of clergy, and a full supply of frequent services at all hours, contrasted curiously with the insignificant little churches of York, each with their solitary priest, and a single mass. Nor was this English idea confined to the Church. The local vestry, and the local parish, always exhibited greater prominence here than in continental cities; and the Paris municipality was always more important than the London corporation. And, curiously enough, the Reform era, which swept away the cathedral bodies, or reduced them to insignificance, also destroyed the secular municipal corporations. The two things lived and died together; and what is still more remarkable, in either branch of the social state we seem to have discovered our hasty error. There is a return to the abandoned principle, though very possibly it may take new forms. Mr. Beresford Hope is pleading for the restoration of the cathedral, or, as we should say, the collegiate, system, in our great towns; and in London, the Metropolitan Government Act, and Mr. Thwaites' representative parliament, may be fairly estimated as a recurrence to the associated and co-operative principle in urban municipal government. To such signs of hope, Mr. Beresford Hope, euonymous in every respect, will doubtless recur. At any rate, we owe him all thanks for his honest and able essay, to point out existing evils, and the way to avoid them.

We may now turn to the scientific and artistic, which is also the largest, portion of this volume, and to the consideration of the material cathedral, a subject which few persons are better qualified to discuss than its accomplished author. Before proceeding, however, to examine in detail Mr. Beresford Hope's arguments and conclusions as to the proper characteristics of an Anglican cathedral church for this nineteenth century, we may perhaps express our satisfaction at the practical ability with which he makes his great stores of archæological and technical learning available for the present service of the Church. It is this which so honourably distinguishes Mr. Beresford Hope, and those who are known to be associated with him in his artistic studies, from others who follow the same pursuits with no other view than a barren antiquarianism. There are many who are great authorities at the meetings of archæological associations as to the history, date, and use of architectural remains, but who go no farther than this. They are destitute altogether of the critical and constructive faculties by which they might make their knowledge practically useful. They are satisfied with inquiring as to the exact age of a church, or with investigating the

cloacæ of a ruined castle. So far they may be depended upon; but probably no advice would be less trustworthy than that of these very archæologists on any question as to the restoration of an old church, or the building of a new one. We do not mean of course to include in these remarks such exceptional cases as that of Professor Willis. In him the power of bringing his vast acquirements to bear on the practical revival of Pointed architecture is not absent, but only in suspense and abeyance. Another scarcely less distinguished architectural writer of the same class, Dr. Whewell, has shown in the new hostel which he has added to Trinity College, Cambridge, that he is competent to grapple with the actual realities of the neo-Gothic style. But our present author always gives us the impression of loving Gothic architecture, not so much for its past glories as for its present and future capabilities in the Church's service. Not that he is less able or less zealous than others as an archæologist, but that he is something much better than an antiquary. The Pointed style is to him not merely the most picturesque type of ancient architecture, nor merely the one most nearly associated historically with our mediæval institutions; but it is the form of architecture which he believes rightly to be consecrated to the religious use of the Church of England. This belief, and the hearty endeavour to reduce this faith into practice, has been the salt which has preserved the so-called Ecclesiological school from the moral stagnation of an effete dilettantism. It may be seen in every page of the volume before us. Hence it is that our author is not satisfied with a dead reproduction of the architecturalists of the past; but he is foremost among the architecturalists of the day, whose watchword it is that the Gothic style has enough vitality to be able to adapt itself to every conceivable demand of an improved civilization; while the mere archæologists stand aghast at the introduction of any feature, or the use of any material, or any process, which had not the authority of English mediæval precedent. Mr. Beresford Hope has done more perhaps than any living man, not only by argument but by example, to establish the principle that our revived Gothic may borrow from every quarter, with unmixed advantage to itself, anything which, not being essentially antagonistic, can be incorporated into, or assimilated with, the style. Hence, while there are some who can still soar no higher than the slavish imitation of ancient undeveloped precedents,—who, for instance, would reproduce a mediæval village church in the streets of a crowded city, or copy a 'Perpendicular' clerestory in a tropical or semi-tropical climate,—Mr. Hope, with Mr. Butterfield's help, has shown us, in the remarkable building in Margaret-street, what a Gothic town church of

the nineteenth century may be, while others have solved the further problem of adapting the Pointed style to the requirements of the torrid zone, as in Mr. Bodley's church at Delhi, and Mr. Burges' cathedral for Brisbane, the capital of Australian Queensland. These considerations are essential for our full appreciation of the fearless spirit with which Mr. Beresford Hope addresses himself to the task now before him, of examining the church architecture of the past, so as to develop the true principles which ought to guide the founders and designers of the present and future cathedrals which are, or which will hereafter be, required by the Church of England and its daughter communities throughout the world.

Having shown, upon social and moral grounds, that the actual religious wants of the day call for churches of the size and scale of cathedrals, that is to say, churches of not less than 200 or 250 feet in length, and of other dimensions in proportion, the first point to be determined is, of course, the general architectural style, the outward form and expression of the building. Mr. Hope is perfectly justified in assuming, as he does, that, at least for ecclesiastical architecture, the common consent of almost all bodies of Christians has decided in favour of the Pointed style. But a further question arises as to what specific variety of the style should be adopted. The nature of the choice to be made cannot be more succinctly stated than in the following extract.

'But a further problem still remains to be solved,—whether any existing variety of Gothic (for there are many) ought most preferably to be adopted in the new cathedral? or again, whether the architect ought to invent, or else close with, some specific new variety, composed out of the numerous elements of the antecedent styles? The materials which exist towards the solution of these questions are manifold. The Gothic of the North offers for our choice the Lancet or First style, more slim in England, more sturdy in France, little known in Germany; the Middle or Decorated species, conspicuous for the grace of its window tracery, and ranging from the Alps to the fiords of Norway; the classically regularly Perpendicular of England; and the exuberant Flamboyant of the Continent. Southern Europe, too, has its varieties, not yet so accurately classed, but all of them broadly distinguishable from those of the North. Facility of travel and breadth of study have placed all these within the ken of the architect; while no absolute law of taste or fashion has yet arisen to compel his choice, strongly as he will find himself solicited, on the one side, by the uncompromising partizans of insular nationality, and on the other, by the admirers of cosmopolitan beauty.'—Pp. 30, 31.

Mr. Hope, with characteristic moderation, stands aloof from any extreme view on this subject. While he comes forward as the advocate of what he calls 'progression by eclecticism,' he takes care to distinguish himself from those who would recklessly break with the past in their desire for change. Next he points

out that the English revival of Gothic architecture was strictly national, and he would moderate the enthusiasm of those who seek—not to engraft upon the home stock the congruous beauties of French or Italian Pointed, but—to substitute these foreign types altogether for our own insular variety of the style. Taking the English Middle Pointed, of the period between 1250 and 1370, as the starting-post of our new development—as being the golden mean of ecclesiastical architecture—he would enrich this style with every improvement of which it is capable. From Italy he would borrow, not what is essentially climatic, but those varieties of colour and material, of which, owing to British skill and commerce, Italy has no longer the monopoly. From the later Gothic forms, those called the Perpendicular and the Flamboyant, he would seize upon their special mastery of the principles of continuity and verticality. We need not consider at length Mr. Hope's detailed contrast of the early French and early English Pointed styles, nor even his description of the culminating Middle Period; although his dissertation is a very favourable specimen of architectural argument,—fresh and graphic and original, without over technicality. It has the advantage also of copious pictorial illustration. Let it suffice to note and endorse the conclusion; which is that the English Middle Gothic is better adapted to be the point of departure for our new or improved style than the French variety of Chartres, Auxerre, or Laon.

Having thus established his middle position between the purely archæological school and the forward spirits who aspire to develop what they call a 'Victorian architecture,' Mr. Beresford Hope makes a pardonable digression by way of defending himself from the charge that might be brought against him that he was more narrow and bigoted in his architectural creed than his father Thomas Hope, the author of the well-known 'History of Architecture.' We quite agree that the services of Thomas Hope to the cause of art in England have never been sufficiently recognised. His son very gracefully, and with much feeling, does justice in these respects to his father's memory. He reminds us of what we owe to Thomas Hope, not only for his indirect patronage of art, but for his own experiments, even when they were unsuccessful. It is true that the first idea of art-manufacture, that is 'of allying the beauty of form to the wants and productions of common life,' was first conceived and exemplified by the gifted author of 'Anastasius,' and that he was quizzed for his pains by Sydney Smith in the *Edinburgh Review*. For our parts we are glad to borrow from his son's pages the following eloquent passage—the peroration of the 'History of Architecture'—which admirably embodies the

views now generally held with respect to the proper architecture of our own country and age.

“No one seems yet to have conceived the smallest wish or idea of only borrowing of every former style of architecture whatever it might present of useful or ornamental, of scientific or tasteful; of adding thereto whatever other new dispositions or forms might afford conveniences or elegancies not yet possessed; of making the new discoveries, the new conquests, of natural productions unknown to former ages, the models of new imitations more beautiful and more varied; and thus of composing an architecture which, born in our own country, grown on our soil, and in harmony with our climate, institutions, and habits, at once elegant, appropriate, and original, should truly deserve the appellation of ‘Our Own.’” —P. 64.

Having thus settled the general style of architecture in which he thinks that a modern cathedral ought to be built, Mr. Beresford Hope next proceeds to discuss the equally important question of its ground-plan. And here he combats *in limine* the objection that a church of cathedral dimensions is suited only for Roman Catholic worship, while the Anglican ritual and the spirit of the Reformed Church demand merely small and compact buildings. This, in fact, is the old objection of Sir Christopher Wren, who, though he built S. Paul's cathedral, yet expressed an opinion that a church for Anglican worship ought not to exceed the area which an average speaker could fill with his voice. The sufficient answer to this is, of course, that while a church is an *auditorium*, it is also something more and something higher. Mr. Beresford Hope thinks the objection deserving of a formal refutation. Accordingly he proceeds to lay down what are the distinctive purposes of a Roman and English cathedral, as a preliminary step to the argument that the latter has its own necessary *differentia* from a mere parish church. Comparing the ground-plan of S. Paul's Cathedral with that of the new votive Church of the Immaculate Conception, designed by Herr Statz of Köln, for the city of Linz, in Western Austria, he finds that while the features which both have in common are an altar, a stalled choir with bishop's throne, a font and a pulpit, the latter has, in addition, a considerable number of chapels, with subsidiary altars. These minor altars, as they are no longer used in our ancient cathedrals, nor included in the general restorations of those churches, are details which no one would dream of reviving in a modern cathedral. The Duomo of Milan, which (as every one knows) was originally designed for the single altar of the severe Ambrosian rite, is an example of a Pointed cathedral of the first class which would be suitable, without alteration, for our Anglican ritual. This theoretic conclusion has been long exemplified in practice in the churches, used as cathedrals, which have been built of late years in the British Islands or the

Colonies. Few, except those who have examined the matter with special care, are aware how many cathedrals have been founded within the last twenty years by the Anglican communion. Mr. Beresford Hope's running commentary on these churches, ranging from Bishop Daniel Wilson's cathedral at Calcutta, to Mr. Burges' most recent design for Brisbane, is not the least attractive portion of his volume, being illustrated with numerous ground-plans and perspective views or elevations. Mr. Butterfield's cathedral of S. Ninian's at Perth, and Mr. Slater's cathedral of Kilmore, are the first in order which are here considered. Then come the late Mr. Carpenter's projected ground-plan for a cathedral at Inverness, and his design for one at Colombo, neither of which have been carried out, though the former is not yet abandoned in intention. Brisbane cathedral, a conception of remarkable originality and ability, seems to us the most characteristic and satisfactory of all these designs. We should be glad, indeed, to hear that there was any chance of its being executed. A church, by Mr. Slater, for S. Kitt's, scarcely claims admission here, as it seems to us, being neither cathedral in dignity nor remarkably well adapted for the climatic conditions of that island. Nor again do we quite understand why the two prize designs for the memorial church at Constantinople—that of Mr. Burges, which has undergone so many and such cruel retrenchments before its erection can be actually begun, and the exquisitely pure and graceful architectural conception of Mr. Street—are represented by their ground-plans in this category. However, we are very glad to possess them; and, for the same reason, we welcome the ground-plan of Mr. G. G. Scott's Lutheran church of S. Nicholas at Hamburg, though we must say that, on Mr. Beresford Hope's own showing, it is scarcely a case in point. For here the design is plainly intended for three altars, if there is any meaning at all in its apsidal choir flanked by two apsidally-ended aisles. It would perhaps have been fairer to Mr. Scott, had his cathedral of S. John's, Newfoundland, been substituted for this fine, but somewhat unreal, Lutheran church. The cathedrals of Fredericton and Montreal are briefly described, and then Mr. Beresford Hope does hearty justice to the motives and munificence of the founder of S. Paul's Cathedral, Calcutta. But the æsthetic delinquencies of this well-meant but most unsuccessful design are almost enough to overweigh our admiration of Bishop Wilson's generosity. Sydney cathedral, and the church now building at Singapore for the Bishop of Labuan (which last is described as a kind of reproduction of Netley Abbey), are the next that are mentioned. Other churches, which serve as cathedrals for the various colonial bishops, have no pretensions to cathedral rank; and,

although some claims are put forward in behalf of Trinity Church, New York, no diocese of the Republican States of North America has as yet advanced to the point of providing a proper church for the reception of the bishop's chair.

Summing up the experience which may be gathered from all these examples, Mr. Hope contends that an architect, intending to design a modern Anglican cathedral, will find that the ruling distinction between a parochial and a cathedral church consists in the different treatment required for the eastern end of the pile. While the parish church requires but a limited sanctuary to hold its modest altar and its one or two officiating priests, the cathedral must have room for a far larger number of ministering clergy, besides accommodation for the bishop, and suitable arrangements for such episcopal functions as ordinations and visitations. We may here quote our author's own language:—

'It is certain that the cathedral would not be perfect without the existence of a body of clergy, both to assist and counsel the Bishop and to serve the Church itself, and of frequent and solemn services at which that capitular body would properly and legitimately officiate. The existence of such a body—the "Chapter" as it is called—involves the construction of a choir of a capacity superior to that of an ordinary parochial church. Then, again, the specific duties which the Bishop himself has to perform, with the assistance of this Chapter—duties, that is, which are the formal cause why there should be an "*ecclesia cathedralis*"—a church with the bishop's chair in it—are all of them of a nature which demand space for their due transaction. Visitations, whether episcopal or archidiaconal, bring together large bodies of the clergy, and their most appropriate place of gathering is the cathedral choir, where, in proportion as they become less of conventional formalities, and more of administrative realities, the necessity for ample sitting-room will be increased. For these objects, at Montreal and Fredericton, as well as elsewhere, special accommodation has been liberally provided with the best effect in the eastern portion of the respective churches. Ordinations, again, are now treated, as they should be, as very solemn realities, which ought not to be performed in a corner. The larger the congregation present is, the more edifying will that rite be; while the common sense of the world has begun to perceive that private chapels are not their most appropriate scene. Upon the additional importance to the rite which its performance in the cathedral itself would give to a town confirmation I need not enlarge; but confirmations emphatically require ample room for their various incidents. These are the absolute legal services and duties of the episcopate, which most pressingly claim the cathedral church as the peculiar home of their celebration, and which necessitate, as the distinguishing feature of that church, an amplitude of space beyond that which is required for the "sittings" or "kneelings" of the average place of worship.'—Pp. 115, 116.

With much adroitness Mr. Hope next presses into his service the recent demands which have been made for special preachings and for large choral gatherings. We do not remember to have seen the observation before, but it is undoubtedly a true one, that the mere fact of the continuous retention of choral service 'through generations of coldness and corruption indicates a current of popularity which must have run very strongly, to

'have run so long.' It is true that the cathedral system need not have been revived at the Restoration. In fact, musicians know better than Mr. Hope, how practically difficult it must have been to set up choral service again, after it had fallen for many years into abeyance, and after all its traditions had been rudely broken. There is no doubt that the musical offices would not have been restored, unless the recollection of them, which so strongly affected even the Puritan Milton, had been very dear to the national mind. With considerable humour Mr. Hope traces, all through the dark Georgian period, the vitality of the choral service of the Church of England, and the subsidiary proofs of the popularity of the use of music in the sanctuary, as proved by the bands and choirs of village galleries, the psalm-singing of the followers of Wesley and Whitfield, the festivals of the cathedral choirs, and the annual muster of the charity children in S. Paul's. The spark which smouldered on in the past age has burst into flame in our own days. The great choral festivals which have been held at Southwell, at Lichfield, and at Ely, when hundreds of village choirs assembled for solemn worship in the mother-church of the diocese, and the naves of those vast buildings were crowded almost to suffocation, have proved incontestably that our largest cathedrals are not too large for solemn diocesan purposes. We make less account for the rage for special preachings. We are not satisfied that there was ever any real demand for these sermons, or that they have done any real good. Besides which, we so far agree with Sir Christopher Wren, in the opinion which we quoted above, that not more than a certain number of persons can ever profitably hear a preacher. Few clergymen are gifted with the lungs of Mr. Spurgeon; and even that orator is said to be now, from prudential motives, more chary of his voice. Still, the argument drawn from the Special Sermons has a certain weight; and whether or no there is much good in assembling more people together to hear a sermon than a preacher can command with his voice, there can be no doubt that the number is all but unlimited that can profitably assist at an act of solemn worship chorally performed by a vast number of singers. The arrangements in the interiors of some of our cathedrals, which have been made for the accommodation of immense congregations, have not been so seemly or judicious as to reconcile us to this particular movement. We prophesy that the day will come, after this particular *furor* has subsided, when the destruction of some of the close screens of our ancient cathedrals will be regretted. Our contemporary, the *Ecclesiologist*, was right, we think, in the distinction which it drew between the ordinary choral services of a cathedral chapter, and the occasional solemn services at

which vast multitudes are assembled. S. Paul's Cathedral, since its alteration, is arranged for the common worship of a mighty crowd, such as may be gathered on a few Sunday evenings during the winter months. How forlorn the interior appears at an ordinary morning service, with a dozen boys, three clergy, and a congregation of two, including the vergers, may be easily imagined. The fact is, that the close choir is very well suited for the ordinary daily services. For special services the nave is available; and ought then, as we believe, to be fitted with a temporary choir and a second altar-table. For even Protestant ritualists, like Mede, have taught us that Christian public worship should always take place in connexion with the Christian 'Mercy-seat.' To some extent, therefore, the arrangements of Westminster Abbey seem to us right in principle. There is, indeed, no altar at the nave services; but a temporary choir is fitted up at the eastern end of the nave, and the proper choir is not yet destroyed. But Durham, Ely, Lichfield, and Chichester have already lost their close screens, to the undoubted injury of the effect of the interior, and to the discomfort of the choir, without any proportional gain. We confess that we should have been glad if Mr. Beresford Hope had expressed himself more decidedly on this important question. We suspect, however, that he has been fascinated by the most exceptional vision of the whole area of a cathedral used for common worship,—a long choir full of surpliced singers, and an enormous nave crowded with kneeling worshippers. But who expects that this will ever be witnessed, except for a time on some Sunday evenings, when there is the attraction rather of some popular preacher than of the highest act of Christian worship? We doubt if the game is worth the candle. We have no great confidence, we must own, in the vitality of such volunteer organizations as those upon which Mr. Beresford Hope seems to depend for filling the stalls and *subsella* of an ideal cathedral with unpaid singers. Nothing, indeed, can be more true and more humorous than his description of the way in which the *mauvaise honte* of a typical Englishman has yielded, and is yielding, to the official garb of a surplice in choir, or of a volunteer uniform on parade. We have no doubt that an energetic parish priest, or even the precentor of a cathedral, may maintain a voluntary choir for a considerable period, especially when anything like an *esprit du corps* can be originated. But this is a very different thing from reckoning upon such an institution for the permanent supply of the deficiencies of the reduced *personnels* of our reformed and impoverished cathedrals. However, we may say, with all sincerity, that we trust Mr. Beresford Hope is more right in his anticipations than we are ourselves.

Another difficulty now looms in the way of the prospective cathedral-builder. He is supposed to have settled his architectural style, the general requirements of his ground-plan, the dimensions of his building, and the proportional relation of his nave, choir, and sanctuary. But on what precise principle is he to arrange the last member of his design? Is he to adopt the typical form of mediæval Gothic—the long-drawn choir, with the sanctuary and its altar at the eastern extremity?—or the Basilican form of church, with its altar midway between the clergy and the people? Are the clergy and singers to intervene between the altar and the laity, or is the altar to divide the people and choristers in the nave from the bishop and his attendant clergy in the synthronus of the eastern apse? This is the question which next engages our author's attention. After describing the two principles of church arrangement in language borrowed from his father's treatise, and after protesting that the discussion is neither strictly architectural nor polemical, he argues against the Basilican form of church upon social grounds solely, and as a question of policy and expediency. His position is, that to revert to a Basilican arrangement would be 'a false anti-quarianism, a forced and exaggerated return to a state of 'feeling, civilization, and laws, which never can recur.' It would be an attempt at reviving the Roman social fabric of the age of Constantine and Theodosius. On the other hand, a wise spirit of 'moderate and retrospective progressionism,' answering to what is called 'liberal conservatism' in politics, would lead us, in our author's opinion, to retain 'the reformatory modification of the mediæval cathedral.' This would be, as he expresses it,

'The correlative of the historical progress of the English people, who now, in the days of Victoria, as once in the days of Edward III., possess their House of Lords and House of Commons, their courts of common law and equity, and their episcopal church—the same in their basis, yet altered, developed, improved, and reformed by the progressive wisdom of centuries.'—P. 143.

The discussion of this subject, in Mr. Beresford Hope's hands, is most interesting as well as instructive. His point is, that the congregational worship of the primitive Church was 'corporate.' The Church met not merely for common acts of worship, but as an organized assembly, 'ecclesia;' in which every part of the body corporate was officially represented, each in its proper place in the appointed 'hall of assembly.' Although we think this idea rather over-subtle, we shall do most justice to our author by allowing him to expound it in its fulness in the following eloquent passage:—

'The early Christian Church was unquestionably "*Civitas Dei*" to a greater extent than the Church has ever since been able to become. This distinctive-

ness of corporate character arose not only from its own unity and purity, but from the depth of civilized corruption in the Pagan world around. North and south, east and west, reigned the same fearful, inevitable, "Res Romana," an empire of ungodliness, which seemed almost coterminous with the wide world itself. Isolated accordingly from all the gravest habits of thought, no less than the popular amusements, of the empire—within, though hardly of, which the early Christians were—they were thrown back upon the organization of their own interior commonwealth, with a depth of veneration and a passionateness of devotion of which the denizens of a Christianised world can hardly form a conception. This Res Romana was absolutely alien to them in its nobler aspirations, no less than in the depths of its unutterable corruption. Its corruption was a foul and confused mass of abnormal sensuality, cruelty, puerile superstition, and atheism. But even in its better aspect it was an organized rebellion against an external and independent revelation, in the form of a national religion where the state claimed not only to define the forms but to create the gods. It was an act of citizenship, and not of faith, to invoke—

Di patrii, Indigetes et Romule, Vestaque mater
Quæ Tuscum Tiberim et Romana Palatia servas;

and the conquering Augustus went to war—

Cum patribus, populoque, Penatibus, et magnis Dīs;

and so the genius of each living Augustus, and the divinity of such of his predecessors as were not obnoxious to the actual representatives of the Cæsardom, became in time the official recipients of the political worship. Against this wickedness it was the mission of the early Christians to protest with their life-blood. Their Lord of Lords and King of Kings was the Eternal Trinity, worshipped through the Incarnate Son; and in proportion as the Roman state was leagued to uphold its adulterate cultus, so the Christian commonwealth was banded round the universal Cross. Suddenly freed from the impending dread of martyrdom, and ensieved with spacious places of worship, and the means of building others, by Constantine, the long-persecuted Christians most naturally carried the expression of their whole system, administrative and hierarchical, as well as ritual, into the distribution of their basilica. The basilica was the church, the court of justice, the chapter-house, and the comitia of the sacred republic. Nay, it was the place of punishment also, for the open shame to which the excommunicate and the "flentes" were for long years put in the eyes of their fellow-Christians, was no small element of primitive discipline. Accordingly the semicircular tribunal of justice became, without a change, the seat of the bishop and his attendant clergy—for synodical deliberation no less than for common worship. They sat there, not merely as ecclesiastics who were either conducting the service or showing forth the example of their own devotions to the people, but as the rulers of the congregated fold upon the seat of majesty. Very soon, or rather simultaneously, another sense, not founded on its material introduction into the Christian economy, but deeply and logically significative, was attached to the semicircular array of clergy. It was no longer the mere transmuted tribunal of the civil judges of the Roman Commonwealth, but the emblem of the Apocalyptic session of the Elders round the Divine Throne. The art of the mosaicist was called in to heighten the significance of this idea, and the conch of the apse displayed the gigantic and awful effigy of the Saviour in judgment, either alone, or in company with angels, apostles, or saints. Sometimes other representations were shown, but the lesson taught was always of the same character; while the arch between the nave and the transepts received the name of the Triumphal Arch, and the broad wall-space over its span was also storied with sacred imagery.

'In the reassignment of the basilica to the needs of Christian worship, there might have been a difficulty in the selection of the place to be occupied by the holiest spot of all—the altar. But the conjoint fact of the magisterial session of the clergy in the bema, and of the symbolical signification assigned to that session, at once raised and solved the difficulty. The Apocalypse not only revealed "God who sitteth upon the throne," but also the Lamb who was slain. Our Lord appears there alike as King and Priest, and as the Victim also, and the basilica had to show Him forth in both characters. The bishop throned at the extremity of the apse furnished one manifestation, the other was sought in the altar and its sacrament. The position for the altar which we should think most natural—the extreme end of the choir—would not have corresponded with the entire conception, for it would have displaced the throne, so the altar was placed forward and detached, between the tribunal and the people, while the officiating priest took his place on its far side (as viewed from the nave), looking over it and towards the general congregation.'—Pp. 152—155.

Mr. Beresford Hope's theory seems to be, that the solemn session of the clergy in the synthronus was designed to symbolize the supremacy of the spirituality in the representative Church, and that accordingly, when the days of persecution were over, and the world had become Christian, the arrangement, having lost its significance, fell gradually into disuse. The embodied *Civitas Dei* could not exist in its ideal and organic purity when the state was no longer heathen and when 'Cæsar's seat had to be 'provided together with the bishop's throne in the Christian 'temple.' It was, he thinks, by an instinctive feeling that the architects of Constantinople, from the beginning, substituted for the old Basilican type another form of church which represented rather the common acts of Christian worship than the solemn representative assembly of the body spiritual. It is more easy to doubt the truth of this ingenious theory than to disprove it. Mr. Beresford Hope has perhaps hit upon the right scent as to the use of the bema and synthronus when, upon the evidence of Torcello and San Ambrogio at Milan, he points out that the bishop and his presbyters met in synod in the former, and the archbishop and his suffragans in council in the latter. This is not improbable, and in this suggestion we may have a clue to one of the most puzzling difficulties of ecclesiological antiquity. Who has not wondered how the bema was used in all the contemporary basilicas of Rome or Ravenna? It is not to be supposed that each such basilica had a bishop; nor that each titular church in Rome had a body of clergy large enough to fill its bema. What then if the bema were the *Capitulum*, so to call it, of each church? In an ordinary church the priest with his assistants, in a cathedral church the bishop with his clergy, might here meet in solemn conclave. Meetings of ecclesiastics which are now held in vestry rooms might assuredly be more fitly convened in the bema of a basilica, in presence of the altar. The formal

arrangements of a Council of the Church, it may be observed, do in some way recall the plan of the bema. No distribution of seats could be more appropriate for a conclave. No one can have attended an election for proctors held, as it sometimes is, in the choir of a church, without feeling how singularly inappropriate the arrangements are for purposes of debate. On the other hand a tribune would be singularly convenient for such a use. A ruridecanal chapter now-a-days is driven to the vestry or the parson's library, because the chancel of the church is so obviously unfit for the meeting from the position of the seats. This hypothesis also explains the coexistence of the bema and of the *chorus cantorum* in San Clemente of Rome; and it is easy to see why the arrangement, however convenient, would gradually fall into disuse, especially when the growth of the monastic system made it necessary to have a *capitulum* of larger dimensions and also fitted for other, such as disciplinary, uses. And curiously enough, the upper church at Assisi, used for the most solemn meetings of the Franciscan order, is arranged in fact after the model of a tribune. There seem to us many reasons for supposing that the synthronus was not solely meant for the seat of the bishop and his attendants at public worship, but for occasional use in some or all of the ways which we have specified. We shall be glad to invite the attention of ritualists to this curious question.

Pursuing his idea that the synthronus was chiefly, if not exclusively, used for the formal seating of the clergy at the public celebration of the Eucharistic service, Mr. Beresford Hope finds, in the examples of this arrangement at Torcello and San Clemente, two merely antiquarian retentions of already disused practices. He would, perhaps, have modified this view had he remembered how numerous the Basilican churches are at Rome and Ravenna, not to speak of the many others scattered about Italy and the eastern coast of the Adriatic. It surprises us to find him drawing so wide a distinction as he does between the Eucharistic service and the other rites and offices of the Church. Again, is there any authority for the supposition that the individual Christian began, in the very earliest times, to regard the shrine of the martyr as an object of deeper interest and affection than the altar itself? We cannot but question the idea involved in the following sentence. 'At once the personal feeling was created, and every worshipper was led to church to deal for his own soul's health with the varying sacred accidents of every sanctuary.' This tendency, in Mr. Beresford Hope's opinion, led to the use of the subsidiary altars in the added chapels in preference to the single common altar of the primitive basilica. And next, the fact that religion was spread in Northern Europe by the monastic

bodies, who, instead of using the vernacular dialects, maintained the old Latin forms of prayer, led to the exclusion of the laity from the regular services of the Church. These services were said in choir, which part of the sacred building became accordingly the most important part of the church: while the common worship, shared by the laity with the clergy, which was practicable when Latin was the common language of all, became no longer possible. Admitting this hypothesis as a sufficient explanation of the peculiar mediæval type of church which was gradually developed north of the Alps, we may well be curious to see how the almost necessary inference is avoided that now, since a vernacular service has been restored, we should do well to revert to that Basilican arrangement which was found so convenient in the primitive age, and which was chiefly superseded, because the laity could no longer take a part in the religious offices of the ecclesiastics. The change itself is excellently described in these sentences:—

‘Rome, upon its inflexible principle of finding a reason and providing a system for every turn of time and tide, has long been ready with *à priori* arguments to show that Latin is the sacred language of the West; but the fact stands patent, in all history, that the lapse from vernacular to dead-tongue services was gradual and imperceptible. As the people’s services at the basilica, in the language of their nursery and their domestic hearth, became the monks’ services in the monastic church, in the language of the Vulgate and the cloister, and of the men who lived very far away, and very long ago; so the arrangement of parts, the inward organization of the services themselves, underwent a perceptible change.’—P. 167.

We wish, too, that we could quote the words in which the gradual perfection of the typical mediæval church is traced from the original basilica to such an abbey-church as that of Cluny, with its altar far removed from the nave, and the long choir shut off from the laity by its high and close screen returned—as it is technically termed—at the west end. Here comes in the turning point of our author’s theory. His ideal cathedral is a compromise between these two ideas. To revert to the Basilica would be, he thinks, an extreme and unjustifiable reaction. The wiser and more cautious policy is to adopt and develop the principles upon which our mediæval forefathers, in order to meet the new wants of their times, modified the ‘exclusive abbey-church’ into the ‘more open cathedral.’ The accomplished French architectural writer, M. Viollet le Duc, has pursued a parallel line of thought in his ‘*Dictionnaire Raisonné de l’Architecture Française*,’ in which he connects this change with the increase of municipal freedom in the great towns. As the present writer forcibly enough expresses it, he conceives of the mediæval cathedral as ‘a minster popularized,’ whereas our author’s view regards it as ‘a basilica minsterized.’ Whatever be the value

of this distinction, Mr. Beresford Hope goes on to observe with approbation that the mediæval bishop, satisfied with his throne in choir and his chair on the north side of the sanctuary for 'pontifical mass,' had the 'commendable tact not to arrogate to himself the tremendous character which his more unworldly predecessor of early days assumed when he sat in the apse beneath the sitting Saviour in the mosaic vault above.' We must confess that we doubt this hypothesis. The ancient patriarchal chair preserved at Canterbury is alone enough to prove that there was no hesitation in assuming the ancient position of the Episcopal throne, where it was possible from the architectural arrangements of the building. If, as we have surmised, this seat was not so much the place whence the bishop took part in the regular offices of worship, as his official *cathedra* or seat of honour, in which he would be enthroned, and from which he would preside on synodical occasions, it is less remarkable that it should not be of universal occurrence in mediæval cathedrals, especially those of less than metropolitical dignity, when it is remembered that every such church had a distinct chapter-house attached to it, which would be a far more convenient theatre for such functions as we have mentioned. We must admit that Mr. Beresford Hope has a rather apposite example of a strained revival of Basilicanism in the pedantic arrangement of the restored Romanesque cathedral of Spire. He complains that the bishop's throne in the apse is far away, 'out of sight and out of sound.' The question, however, we repeat, is whether this throne was ever intended for the bishop's seat during Divine service; and we doubt whether the same criticism might not be passed on the apsidal chair in some of the larger Roman basilicas themselves. Still we are quite ready to agree with Mr. Hope, that, whatever may be the theoretical advantages of the pure Basilican plan, it is at once necessary and expedient in practice for us to be satisfied with our national tradition of church arrangement, and to endeavour to develop and improve it, not to subvert it. It is quite true, as he well observes, that this policy is in harmony with English habits and precedents. We followed this rule in reforming our public offices of worship, and the Church of England has embodied, in a distinct rubric, its will that 'the chancels shall remain as in times past.' No other course was possible in restoring an existing cathedral, than to preserve substantially the relative mediæval positions of the choir and the sanctuary. Mr. Beresford Hope would argue that the substitution of an open for a close screen is not so much a destructive process as a wholesome reform, whereby the proper purpose of the choir is better fulfilled. He is able to add with perfect truth that the founders of new cathedrals among us have

instinctively followed the principles which guided our forefathers. We have no wish in practice to countenance any other system of church arrangement, even though we have freely pointed out a few weak points, as we think them, in Mr. Beresford Hope's argument. The difficulties of reviving the Basilican arrangements in the England of the nineteenth century would be neither small nor few; though we are not sure that we quite agree with Mr. Beresford Hope as to their kind or degree. His safest ground for the conclusion at which he has arrived is that no one really wishes any change. Had we to choose afresh between the two systems on their respective merits, we should probably find it as hard to defend the one as to recommend the other. We will allow the essayist to sum up his conclusion in his own words:—

‘Into the great risk of the change being, from its entire novelty, as unpopular as it would be perplexing, I need not enter. My readers can supply this point for themselves. In any aspect it would, I am convinced, be very inexpedient, when we possess a natural and national tradition of church arrangement, suited to and used in our cathedrals, both old and new, which is every day being better understood, and therefore more popular. In this usage, as we have seen, the bishops and the cathedral clergy modestly abstain from assuming the seats of magisterial dignity, which their predecessors in the primitive ages did not fear to occupy. The bishop, indeed, with us has his throne, but that throne is at the side, where he sits *primus inter pares*; and the only distinction between the clergy and the choirmen and choristers is that of an upper stall. So, too, in the body of the church, the marked distinctions and corporate enrolment of early discipline are wanting; and yet the whole pile is open to the joint worship of those who choose to come, while those who are absent keep aloof on their own responsibility.

‘Let it be proved that this system is less real and less appropriate to our present condition of society than that of the basilica, and I shall then recall my opinion.’—Pp. 188, 189.

From this point the artistic interest of Mr. Beresford Hope's dissertation rather wanes. Leaving the general characteristics of his ideal modern cathedral, he now addresses himself to matters of detail. The minimum area of a cathedral nave, the propriety of a cruciform plan, with the expediency of curtailing the transepts, and the treatment of the central ‘crossing’ or lantern, are the first points which engage his attention. His hints that the neo-Gothic style may possibly develop the octagonal lantern of Ely, Antwerp, and Milan into something finer than Brunelleschi's dome at Florence, or Wren's cupola at S. Paul's, open a most interesting subject of speculation, upon which we must say a few words. His own suggestions point to a polygonal dome with an oval section as the most likely form which such a lantern would assume. He might have strengthened his argument by referring to the distinctly Pointed character of the sections of most of the famous domes in the

Mahometan architecture of the East. The plea for a circular or polygonal nave is less likely to meet support among English ecclesiologists. It is true that this form of building, 'cradled at Jerusalem,' as Mr. Beresford Hope expresses it, 'round the holiest of all shrines,' was adopted of old, not only for baptisteries, but for the naves of churches, as San Vitale of Ravenna, the Dom at Aachen, S. Gereon at Köln, and our Round Churches in England. But none of these examples are very promising. The buildings in question are indeed of unique interest, but they are far from convenient. The ground-plans of the churches of Aachen and S. Gereon, which Mr. Bersford Hope lays before us, are worth considering in this light, as a mere matter of church arrangement. Our author, mindful of the conservative policy which had led him to withstand the revival of Basilican arrangements, guards himself against the retort that a circular nave would be a still greater innovation, by the reply that he does not propose to invert the organic parts of his church, but merely to alter the shape of one part. Accordingly he assumes that his circular nave will have a spacious choir attached to it; and he himself observes that the junction of the two is the real practical difficulty in the way of his suggestion. To us, however, he seems to overlook the far more grave difficulty which underlies the use of a circular structure. The proper function of a domical building seems to be to inclose some object of reverence which occupies its centre. For our Lord's tomb it was instinctively felt that a domed circle would form the most appropriate shrine. So again for a baptistery—over and above the symbolical reasons which Mr. Beresford Hope elsewhere mentions—the circular, or octagonal, or polygonal form is by far the most convenient shape—the actual font occupying the exact centre of the building. In like manner it is the 'confessio' of S. Peter which gives its full significance to the dome of the Vatican; and the shrine-like tomb prepared for the first Napoleon, though itself an after-thought, was felt to give a reason, so to say, for the cupola of the Invalides. In like manner it may be remarked that the position of the grave of Nelson in S. Paul's, 'just under the very centre of the dome,' is repeatedly referred to, by a sort of instinct, as though it gave the required key to the use and purpose of the vast cupola above it. The truth is that a circular church, if used for the general purposes of a church and not merely as a shrine or a baptistery, seems to require that its altar should occupy the centre. This it is which makes the dome of Florence so deeply impressive; and the same may be said of the otherwise cold and unpleasing domical interior of the neighbouring San Lorenzo. It has often been urged that the proper arrangement of S. Paul's Cathedral would require

Beresford Hope on the Modern English Cathedral.

the altar, under a baldachin, to be brought down under the dome. Without expressing a decided opinion upon this suggestion, we may at least observe that the effect of the way in which this vast area has been made available for the special services is about as unsatisfactory as can be conceived. The innovation of a central altar is so hyper-Basilican and revolutionary that we do not much wonder at Mr. Beresford Hope's significant silence on the subject.

There will be little or no difference of opinion as to most of the other details which are next discussed in succession. The great importance of breadth, and of well-devised interior levels, is admitted on all hands. Mr. Beresford Hope argues against the central position of the organ and against recessing the stalls between the piers of the choir-arcades, as has been done at Wells and at Durham. The matter of fixed seats *versus* movable chairs is left by him as an open question. Touching the east end, he advocates warmly the employment of the apse and surrounding aisle—the *chœur* of French Gothic—where space and funds permit. He speaks with all the weight of experience and practical knowledge when he advises that the altar should be brought forward from the east walls even in a square-ended choir, and that in apsidal east ends it should stand on the chord of the arc. Commending the reredos-treatment of the restored choirs of Ely and Lichfield, he laments—and he claims the support of the late Sir Charles Barry in this judgment—the present undignified position of the altar at the extreme east end of the choir-apse of S. Paul's.

In connexion with the triple division of the interior height of a church between arcade, triforium, and clerestory, Mr. Beresford Hope discusses episodically a very curious point of church arrangement, viz. the use of a triforial gallery. Abandoning early precedents, or those of Byzantine origin, he finds such galleries in San Ambrogio, at Milan; San Michele, at Pavia; and, north of the Alps, in S. Castor of Coblenz; and in most of the later churches of the Romanesque of the Rhine. Dr. Whewell, as is well known, considers that such triforial galleries were used for the accommodation of some classes of the congregation. Mr. Hope seems to think that, although they may have been often put to a practical use, they are due to nothing else than a constructional convenience, which was followed out with 'that superb disregard of space which characterises so many other features of mediæval church-building.' He does not enter upon the equally curious question as to the purpose of the narthex-galleries which are so often found in Germany, and which seem, on the authority of Mr. Neale's recent '*Ecclesiological Notes in Dalmatia, &c.*,' to extend

far down the valley of the Danube. Practically, Mr. Beresford Hope advises, that if galleries are needed in modern churches, they should form part of the original construction, on the type of the enlarged triforia of the Romanesque and earlier Pointed styles. From the triforium our author mounts to the clerestory and the roof. We need not say that he lays it down as an axiom that a cathedral church should have a vaulted roof. But he does not absolutely forbid a wooden groining, and he is tempted beyond his self-imposed limits to speculate on the possibility of roofing a vast area, lightly and inexpensively, with a metal framework, filled in with slabs of porcelain or terra-cotta. In his further remarks about steeples, porches, and the western *façade*, there is nothing to call for observation. He concludes the purely architectural part of the work with some excellent advice as to the use of colour in internal decoration, and a *résumé* of the rapid progress of architectural art in England. He looks to the facilities of constructive coloration which modern science and means of transport have given us, as likely to afford us some compensation for the greater simplicity of plan which the ritual of the Church of England imposes upon our new churches and cathedrals. We must here allow ourselves one more quotation.

‘Above all, the unity of all art is beginning to be practically recognised. The architect, the painter, and the sculptor no longer selfishly pursue their own independent profession, as if they were rivals and antagonists, but they either of themselves borrow, from time to time, their neighbour’s craft, or else they combine together—while each adheres to his own department—to complete those works whose failure or whose success depends upon the combination. Giotto, it is at last recollected, both painted and built; and Michael Angelo was sculptor, painter, and architect.

‘In one word, ecclesiastical, and, indeed, all architecture in England, is at this moment working out for itself that lesson which the equalising effects of science now enable northern regions to learn to an extent which used to be only allowed to the warmer south—that of the fusion of construction and decoration in the variety of materials, natural and artificial, and the contrast of their forms and colours. It is the experimental adoption of this system which makes the broad distinction between the more meritorious new churches of the ten last years and their predecessors built within the ten preceding years. Accordingly I anticipate that our new cathedral will show still more complete and gorgeous developments of English polychromatic architecture than we have yet beheld. I go further, and I say that it is to the successful working out of this element of beauty that I look in the new cathedral as the compensating æsthetic advantage for the disuse of those constructional features—those double aisles and fringing chapels—of the old cathedral which, with all their grandeur and their loveliness, can find no place in our purer and simpler system.’—Pp. 251, 252.

Those who have followed us so far will not need to be reminded that a more exhaustive or practical architectural

treatise than the present has seldom issued from the press. No one can speak with more authority on such subjects than our present author, who is known not only as a zealous student of architectural art, but as an actual church-builder on the largest and most sumptuous scale. He has produced a volume which cannot fail to become the manual of those who will be called upon in future years to found or to design cathedrals. Let us hope that he may have the satisfaction of seeing his advice followed in the construction of many a sacred fane. This will not be the least of the author's services to the Church of England.

NOTICES.

WE have received intimations from various quarters of the interest excited by the account given in this Review, just a twelvemonth since, of the writings of Prince Albert de Broglie. We may therefore feel sure that many of our readers, who have formed some idea of his powers of treating the *past*, as exhibited in the 'L'Église et l'Empire Romain,' will not be sorry to see a notice of two volumes of reprints from the same pen, entitled 'Questions de Religion et d'Histoire' (Paris: Levy), which, for the most part, bear more upon the *present*. We have not yet had time to examine all the separate essays as they deserve, but we may venture to characterise a few of the principal ones. One on the civilization of the sixteenth century contains something like an apology for that Renaissance movement, which has been so fiercely attacked, not only by Englishmen (such as Palgrave, Robert Browning, and Ruskin), but even still more severely, if possible, by the ultramontane school in France. M. de Broglie's view of the case is original and interesting. He is justly severe upon M. Michelet's history of that epoch. Besides a very pleasing sketch of the late great pulpit orator, M. de Ravignan, we have a critique on the state of public opinion respecting the great French Revolution, and another of Armand Carrel, which are weighty political studies. In the second volume we find, *inter alia*, a spirited defence of the author's 'L'Église et l'Empire' against the extremely unfair and uncharitable attacks of Dom. Gueranger; and some remarks upon the temporalities of the Papacy, which do not seem to us *quite* free from the besetting fault of French writers on this theme; namely, a disposition to think too little about the happiness of the Italians, and too exclusively about *la gloire de la France*. We suppose, however, that the author will hardly be summoned for this paper before a legal tribunal, as his father, the Duc de Broglie, has just been for his lithographed and private pamphlet. But in the estimation of Anglican theologians, the palm of excellence among these essays will probably be assigned to the masterly and admirable reply of M. de Broglie to the 'Religion Naturelle' of M. Jules Simon. We really do not know where to look for a weightier demonstration of the insufficiency of mere Theism for man's spiritual needs, even when that Theism is combined with such moral purity and warmth of philanthropy as that of M. Simon.

We are enabled to speak in the highest terms of commendation of Mr. Stobart's 'Daily Services for Christian Households.' Our own experience has proved to us that it is well adapted for the purpose for which it was published, and which its title designates. The 'Services' for each day are neither too long nor too short. They are not sermons disguised as prayers, nor are they too much broken up into versicles and responses.

They consist of Confession, Supplication, Praise, Intercession, a Psalm, a Lesson, and a Hymn. Special Collects are added in the Appendix.

The Rev. A. J. D. D'Orsey has delivered a Lecture at the Royal Institution 'On the Study of the English Language,' and has printed his lecture in an extended form (Deighton). His object is to put in a plea for the study of English as an essential part of a University course. He is wise enough not to run a tilt against Classics and Mathematics, but to propose that they should be supplemented by a course of English. We have some fear lest poor Classics and Mathematics should be so 'supplemented' by 'English,' 'Law,' 'Modern History,' 'Natural Science,' and all the *ologies*, as to be swallowed up amongst them, otherwise we have nothing to object to in Mr. D'Orsey's proposal. It is quite certain that a much more extended knowledge of the English language and of English literature than that which they possess, would be of the utmost advantage to most men who leave the University. The time between the B.A. degree and Ordination is, in fact, generally directed to an unsystematic study of English authors. But it is more for the language than for its literature that Mr. D'Orsey pleads. Being a Cambridge man himself, he does not make quite sufficient allowance for what is already done for English composition at Oxford. The weekly essay given at the better colleges, the English essay in the final classical examination, the ethical and historical answers to be written in English, as well as translations to and from the ancient languages and English, must give the better class of students a very considerable familiarity with their mother tongue, even without taking into consideration the studies necessitated by the Law and Modern History school. Still there is room for improvement, if it can be made without displacing the essential studies of the place; and an English Lectureship, such as that held by Mr. D'Orsey himself at Cambridge, is, we think, likely to be productive of some good. The Lecture is written with ability, and the notes and appendices show that the lecturer bestowed infinite pains in working up his subject by reference to numberless authorities. There is one point on which we must beg to differ from him. His suggestion of allowing schoolmasters to look forward to Government Inspectorships, in order to encourage education, reminds us of the proposal that 'the Church' should be 'thrown open' to parish clerks. The parish clerk would be as competent to do the work of the clergyman as the schoolmaster that of the inspector. The glossographical maps and tables accompanying the Lecture are valuable.

We have received the second fascicle of Mr. George Forbes's edition of S. Gregory Nyssen, a work which quite recalls the days of the Mabillons, and Le Quiens, and Holsteins. We hope to notice it at length in our next number; in the meantime, we can only say that the English Church may well be proud of one of her sons who can bring out such an edition of a most difficult author, as we are certain no other living scholar in Europe is capable of producing. In all respects we recommend this edition to our readers, as a work of most uncommon learning, and as a work—for it proceeds from the Pitsligo Press—of hardly less uncommon accuracy.

'The Church in the Public School' (Oxford: J. H. Parker), is the title of a sermon by the Rev. James Skinner. It is not only valuable in itself, as setting forth the respected author's thoughtful views of the real dangers that beset our youth, but is likewise interesting as urging the claims of S. Mary's College, at Harlow, and making more widely known the merits of that institution, and the remarkable manner in which it appears to have been blessed.

We have been disappointed in not being able to lay before our readers a review of Mr. Bright's 'History of the Church, from A.D. 313 to 451' (Oxford and London: J. H. Parker). For the present, therefore, we must be content to express our conviction of the great importance of this addition to our theological literature. At a time when so much of second-rate and second-hand learning is being foisted into our theology, it is truly refreshing to meet with a volume evincing such sound trustworthy research into the *original* authorities for the annals of the time of which it treats. We can confidently speak, from our own investigations, of the scrupulous accuracy of Mr. Bright's work. Few books contain so much compressed information; and though we at times halfregret that the limits of the volume have not allowed space for the display of more of the individual characters and of the indirect action of the Church upon heathenism, it may be safely asserted that there is no prominent saint, doctor, or heresiarch of the time, of whom the reader will not obtain from this small volume a correct and vivid idea, as well as of the general government and fortunes of the Church.

From the Liturgical Revision Society, or from a Liturgical Revision Society, we have received one or two pamphlets. We mention the matter chiefly to show that the snake was not scotched by the protest of the 10,000 clergy. It appears that there is an Irish Revision Society as well as that which publishes curious pamphlets under the title of 'Ingoldsby.' The Irish revisionists have, we find, invited corrections of the Prayer Book, by circulating manuscript forms of fault-finding. The result is before us in a pamphlet, 'Amendments in the Book of Common Prayer, prepared by the Committee of the Liturgical Amendment Society (Ireland),' (Hamilton, Adams & Co.) We extract an amendment or two to show the sort of temper of mind in which revisionists approach holy things. 'The final s to be added to Jesu wherever it is omitted.' 'In the Second Collect after the Commandments, for "kings" substitute "sovereigns." 'In the "Exhortation" commencing "Dearly beloved, on Sunday next," &c. for "I purpose," insert "It is purposed;" and omit the word "other" before "discreet."' Let us hazard a revision, and suggest in the case of the clerical revisionists the omission of the word 'discreet' in connexion with themselves. We must, however, place on record that, in a pamphlet entitled 'The further Revision of the Liturgy with reference to "Essays and Reviews," &c.' (Hamilton & Co.), the Bishop of Gloucester, now of Durham, the new Bishop of Durham, to some extent the Primate of Ireland, and Lord Lyttelton, are claimed as more or less favouring revision, and as many as forty-eight pamphlets during the last year only, have been

published on this subject. As in the kindred case of the attempted change in the marriage laws, we are never safe while money, agitation and organization can be commanded.

Mr. W. B. Flower has translated certain of the well-known 'Sermons of S. Bernard on the Church Seasons' (Masters). The volume is a creditable one to Mr. Flower's taste and scholarship, and a 'discreet and learned' sermon writer might take hints from the warm, glowing language of S. Bernard. We deprecate, what, however, is a mistake not very likely to be committed, anything like a wholesale conversion into our pulpits of what is in form and language often unsuitable to these times.

'Egyptian Sepulchres and Egyptian Shrines,' by Miss Emily Beaufort (Longman), is an unexpected treat. We must own to something like an ungallant prejudice against lady travellers, after certain publications of certain ladies who have galloped over Europe and scampered through all sorts of out-of-the-way places in masculine costume, and have described their wanderings in characteristic language. But Miss Beaufort is a traveller of a very different cast. She writes with equal modesty and information. She is really an accomplished antiquarian; and we know no book more useful for the ground over which it goes than these two volumes, not the least or last merit of which consists in some pretty illustrations.

Anything which comes from Dr. M'Caul, especially on subjects involving Hebrew learning, demands respectful attention. His 'Some Notes on the First Chapter of Genesis' (Wertheim), contain criticism and literature which no student ought to pass by. We do not say that on all points Dr. M'Caul is conclusive. But all that he says is important.

'Recent Recollections of the Anglo-American Church in the United States,' by A Layman (Rivingtons), exhibits a very fair and full account of existing facts. It will furnish the materials of a history which is yet to be written. We cannot say that these two volumes are systematic or well put together; but they abound in facts. Apparently the writer or compiler has had a good deal of acquaintance both with living men and the private particulars of current events. His book reads rather like extracts from newspapers; and there is a spice of personal resentment here and there which detracts from its permanent value; though perhaps 'the Layman' does not claim the judicial impartiality of the historian. We may remark, that his sympathies are Northern enough to satisfy Mrs. Beecher Stowe.

The *esquisse*—to use a French term for which we have scarcely an equivalent—on 'Irish History and the Irish Character,' by Professor Goldwin Smith (J. H. and Jas. Parker), is not less remarkable as a fair example of what liberalism in its best form is, than as a specimen of English composition. Very possibly it will offend extreme partisans on either side: but of this the accomplished author is careless. His *thesis* is, that in the melancholy history of Ireland faults on both sides exaggerated and stimulated each other, and that in judging of political crimes we

should make allowances for misfortunes arising from circumstances over which rulers and subjects have no control. He finds the history of Ireland modified by religion, law, climate, and the accidents of civilization ; and he brings out the fact, too often lost sight of, that misfortunes have as much to do with history as circumstances. This sketch deserves very careful study.

It is instructive as well as interesting to be reminded from time to time what was the theology of our fathers and grandfathers. The Oxford movement is regarded by so many persons as the origin and starting point of orthodox theology in the present century, that it is useful to be taught that the same sound Church of England doctrine which we have seen revived and slandered was held by a Dr. Routh, a Joshua Watson, and many another clergyman and layman, as the undoubted traditional belief of the Church of England. The Rev. Richard Lyne was a man of great simplicity of character, of deep theological study, and of very considerable general learning. He shut himself up in his little parish of S. Petroc Minor, in Cornwall, and spent the time which was not given to his flock in pious meditation and study. We believe that some very valuable meditative works, which he has left behind him, will be published. We shall hail them with pleasure. The little volume which his daughter now puts forth consists of 'Two Letters' (Wertheim and Macintosh), the first on the authority of the Old Testament, called by him 'Vindiciæ Veteris Testamenti,' the second, on the 'Eternity of Future Punishment.' Of course, the circumstances of the day have made his daughter select these letters for present publication. The following sentence is a characteristic example of the homely and straightforward way in which orthodox Churchmen wrote at the end of the last century:—'The first Christian dissenter was Simon Magus, a man of extraordinary abilities' (p. 60). It is quite true, but no one could express himself in such terms now. We shall be glad to make further acquaintance with Mr. Lyne.

INDEX TO VOL. XLII.

(NEW SERIES.)

ARTICLES AND SUBJECTS.

A.

Associated Religious Efforts [*Kaiserwerth Deaconesses, &c.*], 200—223.

B.

British Confession, Churches of the [*Morgan, Wright, &c.*], 441—465.
Burke and Washington [*Macknight's Life of Burke, Custis' Recollections of Washington*], 297—318.

C.

Captivity, Princes of the [see *West*].
Cathedral, Modern English [*Beresford Hope on the, &c.*], 466—495.
Clergy Discipline [*Statutes, &c.*], 251—276.
Climbers [see *Mountains*].

D.

Desgenettes, the Abbé [*Œuvres de l'Abbé, &c.*], 113—148.
Discipline [see *Clergy*].

E.

Eastern Church [*Stanley's Lectures, &c.*], 224—250.
Early English Church [*Hook's Lives of the Archbishops, &c.*], 73—108.

F.

Froude's History of England [*From Fall of Wolsey to Death of Elizabeth*], 1—22.

J.

James, John Angell [*Life and Letters of, &c.*], 319—345.

NO. CXV.—N.S.

H.

Henry VIII. [*Thomas Pilgrim*], 346—360.
Hook, Dean [see *Early English Church*].
Hope, Beresford [see *Cathedral*].

M.

Mountains and Climbers [*Publications of Alpine Club, &c.*], 361—380.

O.

Owen on Dogmatic Theology [*Introduction to the Study of, &c.*], 179—199.

P.

Patriarchs of the West [see *West*].
Powell's Essay [*On the Evidences of Christianity*], 149—178.

R.

Religious Efforts [see *Associated*].

S.

Sephardim [*Bédaride's Jews in France, &c.*], 381—407.
Septuagint [*H. Churton's Prize Essay, &c.*], 109—112.
Sibylline Oracles, the [*Edited by Friedlieb, &c.*], 277—296.

W.

Washington [see *Burke*].
Watson, Joshua [*Memoirs of, edited by Churton*], 23—49.
West, Patriarchs of the [*Gosse's History of the Jews*], 50—72.
Western Church, Studies of the [*Gams, Gorres, &c.*], 408—440.

N N

SHORTER NOTICES OF BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

OCTOBER.—Prince Albert de Broglie's Questions de Religion et d'Histoire—Stobart's Daily Services for Christian Households—Rev. A. J. D. D'Orsey's Lecture on the Study of the English Language—Forbes's Edition of S. Gregory Nyssen—Skinner's Sermon, The Church in the Public School—Bright's History of the Church, from A.D. 313 to 451—Amendments in the Book of Common Prayer, prepared by the Committee of the Liturgical Amendment Society—The further Revision of the Liturgy with re-

ference to 'Essays and Reviews,' &c.—Flower's Translation of S. Bernard's Sermons on the Church Seasons—Miss Emily Beaufort's Egyptian Sepulchres and Egyptian Shrines—Dr. M'Caul's Some Notes on the First Chapter of Genesis—Recent Recollections of the Anglo-American Church in the United States, by a Layman—Professor Goldwin Smith's Irish History and the Irish Character—Lyne's Two Letters, Vindicating Veteris Testamenti, and Eternity of Future Punishment.



